

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Quarterly

VOLUME XXXIII

(New Series, Volume XXII)

1951

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT HISTORY
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO

BX
940
.M63

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXIII

ARTICLES

CADILLAC'S LAST YEARS. <i>Jean Delanglez</i>	3
BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CADILLAC	39
REPORT ON MISSION SANTA ROSALIA. <i>Peter Masten Dunne</i> . .	43
LAWLESSNESS IN CAIRO, ILLINOIS, 1848-1858. <i>Harold E. Briggs</i>	67
"VISITING STATESMAN" IN LOUISIANA, 1876. <i>Ralph J. Roske</i> .	89
VENEZUELAN EDUCATION DURING LIBERATION. <i>John E. Baur</i> .	103
TRADE INTERESTS OF XVIII CENTURY BRITISH TRAVEL WRITERS. <i>Herman J. Muller</i>	139
THE RELIGION OF BOLIVAR. <i>Jerome V. Jacobsen</i>	158
THE RELIGION OF BOLIVAR. <i>Jerome V. Jacobsen</i>	203
TIT FOR TAT: A NOVEL OF SOCIAL CRITICISM. <i>George L. Phillips</i>	225
VICEROY TOLEDO AND THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN MARCOS. <i>Paul</i> <i>S. Lietz</i>	242
BOOK REVIEWS	56, 128, 188, 256
NOTES AND COMMENTS	61, 131, 195, 259
INDEX	261

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 33, NUMBER 1

JANUARY 1951

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JANUARY 1951

VOLUME 33

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 22

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

CADILLAC'S LAST YEARS	<i>Jean Delanglez</i>	3
BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CADILLAC		39
REPORT ON MISSION SANTA ROSALIA	<i>Peter Masten Dunne</i>	43
BOOK REVIEWS		56
NOTES AND COMMENTS		61

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
PAUL S. LIETZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JANUARY 1951

VOLUME 33

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 22

NUMBER 1

Cadillac's Last Years

I. Detroit Debacle

With Cadillac's appointment as governor of Louisiana his troubles at Detroit with the Indians, the settlers, the Jesuits, and with the traders of the west and Montreal and Quebec would seem to have come to an end. He was finished with the Jesuits, since he met them no more either in France or in Louisiana. As far as the Miami, Huron, and Ottawa Indians were concerned there would be repercussions because of his poor handling of the situation at Detroit and Michilimackinac, especially in view of the continuation of Queen Anne's War and the English-Iroquois threat to the French possessions and trade of the Great Lakes region. "Enemies" and opponents he was bound to have in France, in New France or in Louisiana, because he was Cadillac. It remains then, for the purpose of closing the pages on the life of Cadillac at Detroit, to offer in a general way the story of the last nineteen years of his life. First there is question of the manner in which his property and interests in Detroit de Pontchartrain were finally settled. Then there will be traced very briefly his adventures in Louisiana and his last days in France.

It will be recalled that on July 6, 1709, Pontchartrain wrote to Cadillac branding his work at Detroit as a failure.¹ He had not kept the Miami, Ottawa, and Huron Indians at peace among themselves, and had placed the fort in danger by bringing the Indians and their animosities together in one place, and by allowing them to deal with the feared Iroquois. Pontchartrain pointed out the specific cases in which Cadillac had failed to advance the interests of the king, but he promised that nothing would be done about the matter for that year.²

¹ MID-AMERICA, XXXII (October, 1950), 253-258.

² *Ibid.*, 256.

Less than a year later, on May 5, 1710, Pontchartrain named Cadillac governor of Louisiana, and placed him and the area under the jurisdiction of the governor of New France, Louis Phillipe de Rigaud, Marquis de Vaudreuil. Word of this did not get to Cadillac for six months, that is, officially, but unofficially the signs indicated to him that he was being relieved at Detroit. In the first place the troops of the fort were to be withdrawn to Montreal and in the second place the king refused further support for the post. When Cadillac heard this news he called together the settlers of Detroit on June 7, 1710 to see about their helping to defray the expenses. The result of the meeting was embodied in a resolution signed on that day.³ Cadillac informed the meeting "that His Majesty was withdrawing his troops to Montreal on his having refused to supply them with food, and that therefore His Majesty would defray no expense" at Detroit. The first necessity was to obtain a priest, which would require that he and the inhabitants should subscribe five hundred livres annually for his support. The resolution to do this was passed and signed and it included in the taxpayers the *voyageurs* and others who might come to trade.

It became a question now of paying for the transportation of the troops returning from Detroit to Montreal. Vaudreuil and the Intendant, Raudot, sent for the troops and paid the charges at His Majesty's expense, then reported to Pontchartrain that they thought Cadillac should reimburse the king "since they went up only at his request, and came down because he refused to supply them with food."⁴ Debts seemed to be mounting for the commandant of Detroit.

About this time Pontchartrain's selection of Cadillac for the Louisiana post reached Vaudreuil in Quebec. Vaudreuil wrote this to Cadillac on September 13, 1710.⁵ His Majesty, the governor said, had appointed him to Louisiana and at the same time had made Laforest commandant at Detroit. Laforest could not leave until the spring of the following year, consequently at his request, Vaudreuil continues, M. Dubuisson was appointed to act for him as his lieu-

³ Extract from a Resolution Passed . . . June 7, 1710, in *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society Collections* (MPHS), Vol. 33, 478-479.

⁴ Extract from Reports of Vaudreuil and Raudot, MPHS, 33: 477-478.

⁵ Vaudreuil to Cadillac, from Quebec, Sept. 13, 1710, MPHS 33: 483-484; King Louis XIV to Lamothe Cadillac, at Marly, May 13, 1710, in *Mississippi Provincial Archives 1704-1743, French Dominion*, (MPA), Collected, edited and translated by Dunbar Rowland and Albert Godfrey Sanders, Jackson, Mississippi, 1932, Vol. III, 142-150; since the king's instructions to Cadillac were substantially changed two years later there seems no need to consider them in detail.

tenant. The will of His Majesty was that Cadillac should "go at once to Louisiana overland." Then the governor gave Cadillac a loophole, saying that if his affairs did not permit him to depart so soon he should give his advice to Dubuisson. However, Cadillac was ordered to cause the lieutenant to be recognized as the commandant.

Charles Renaud, Sieur Dubuisson, on his part was fortified with his own orders. He had his commission from Vaudreuil, and in it, in the name of the king all those at Detroit or coming there were enjoined to recognize his authority.⁶ Besides this official paper he had a memorandum from Vaudreuil, telling him to take all instructions from Laforest and to show respect to M. de la Mothe. He was to permit Cadillac, who is always termed de la Mothe by the governor, to take all those who wish to go with him to Louisiana, *provided* that each settles his affairs before leaving. And he was to take advice from Cadillac for the good of the king's service.

François Daupin, Sieur de Laforest, added items to his lieutenant's packet. There was first a friendly letter to Cadillac.⁷ Laforest begins by expressing his surprise at the appointment to Detroit, especially since he had expressly represented to Pontchartrain the poor condition of his health and his inability to make long journeys, "to which he has paid no attention, & he apparently wishes me to end my life in uncivilized countries." He was aware that the court had ordered Cadillac to set out immediately, but he knew the impossibility of fulfilling the order. He did not expect Cadillac to leave Detroit that winter. He begged Cadillac to help Dubuisson with his counsel and advice, for which he and his lieutenant would be grateful. "In regard to the goods remaining to you at Detroit I hope we shall have no difficulties, you and I, in that respect; and in case there should be any, Mgr. de Pontchartrain will have the kindness to decide on them, on the report of the valuation which will be made by skilled men. I beg you, Sir, to have M. Dubuisson lodged as conveniently as may be."

Laforest's instructions to his man were equally friendly toward Cadillac.⁸ If M. de La Mothe is worried about his mill, cattle and other properties, Dubuisson is to tell him that Laforest will take over all things at the price set by an independent evaluator, Monseigneur de Pontchartrain. The payment for grinding corn and wheat is to be

⁶ Vaudreuil to Dubuisson, Sept. 13, 1710, and Laforest to Dubuisson, Sept. 13, 1710, MPHS, 33: 484, 485.

⁷ Laforest to Cadillac, *Ibid.*, 486.

⁸ Laforest to Dubuisson, Jan. 10, 1711, *Ibid.*, 495-496.

the fourteenth minot, (which was what Cadillac should have been charging according to royal orders.) Those renting houses or lands from Cadillac are to be told that their new landlord is Laforest. Traders are to be told that whatever contracts they had made with Cadillac will be taken over by Laforest. Since M. de La Mothe was no longer carrying on trade, Dubuisson might make use of the warehouse, but if he had even the slightest objection the matter was to be dropped.

The lieutenant made his way from Quebec to Detroit, where on December 5, 1710, he turned over the papers to Cadillac, including Pontchartrain's instructions to Laforest.⁹ Cadillac promptly set his wits to work to take all possible advantage of the governor's orders and Laforest's friendliness. It was, of course, impossible for him to set out for Louisiana during December, so he saw to it that the time generously allotted for straightening out his affairs at Detroit would be shortened or lengthened to suit his purposes. He apparently tried various petty schemes to get as much as possible for his holdings in Detroit, before beginning his bickerings with Laforest.

His schemes may be readily gathered from a reading of Dubuisson's orders to him given in formal style on January 17, 1711.¹⁰ The lieutenant had learned that Cadillac was granting contracts for lands and places within the fort. Dubuisson told him flatly that this was contrary to the instructions of both Laforest and Pontchartrain, which he had shown him and, therefore, of which he could plead no ignorance. Moreover, the fort under the same orders was to be divided up differently and made smaller. The implication is clear that Cadillac was offering invalid contracts and moreover for sites which were soon to be eliminated.

Next, Dubuisson had been informed that Cadillac had been telling the inhabitants that he, Cadillac, would grant them lands. The illegality of this was clear, for the lands were domains of Detroit. Furthermore, if this were done, Cadillac would clearly be eliminating the possibility of growing wheat and therefore eliminating the possibility of provisioning the fort.

In the third place, Dubuisson wrote:

I shall have the honor to tell you that the inhabitants have represented to me that you had promised them to lend them animals to draw the timber which they had agreed to supply to you for the repair of the Fort, which gives them the opportunity of saying now that without this help they cannot make up the quantity which I ask them for, which is however less than that

⁹ Pontchartrain to Laforest, May 15, 1710, AC, B 32: 670 ff.

¹⁰ Dubuisson to Cadillac, Jan. 17, 1711, MPHS, 33: 496-497.

which they had promised you, since I assign only five [animals] to each one; you know well Sir that this sort of people seek only for a chance of getting out of what is demanded of them, which is, however, only for their safety, besides which it would be disgraceful to us not to put our Fort in a state of preparation. The 8ta8ois and the Hurons, who have recently repaired theirs have reproached us for our negligence.

After telling Cadillac to inform the inhabitants otherwise than he had, and to inform them about payment for the animals, Dubuisson asks him to save ten minots of wheat for sowing. He will pay a *reasonable* price for them, he says, seeing that you alone have French wheat to sell. The implication is quite clear.

In the final two paragraphs Dubuisson give two orders which are indicative of the manner in which Cadillac might have been making some money. The first forbids him to sell any animals in his possession, because they were to be attached to the domain of Detroit, according to the orders of Raudot. The second bade him to turn over some powder and shot for the defense of the Fort. He specified just how much Cadillac had received, and stated that Cadillac was to give an account of what he had used and then turn the remainder over to him. A receipt would be given for what was received.

From these orders several facts become obvious. Cadillac had been sowing seeds of dissention whose fruit would be the ruin of Detroit. The inhabitants were put in doubt as to the actual ownership of the fort, the properties around about, the animals, the grains, and the command. The soldiers, probably thirty, did not know if they could go with Cadillac or if they were bound to remain, and they would have no assurance of pay or food. The traders were in doubt about their contracts. Everybody concerned was in a position of insecurity about the future. Cadillac could remain and tell everybody that it was not clear whether Laforest and his lieutenant were simply the military command or whether they had rights to the property and trade. And this he did bring up continuously for years. He could say that he was not bound to depart until his affairs had been settled. He could and did appeal from Dubuisson to the intendants, from them to Vaudreuil, from Vaudreuil to them, and from the government of New France to Pontchartrain. By his control of all the available wheat seed and by holding all of the available powder and shot he was in a good bargaining position. Actually, he did not turn over to Dubuisson a grain of the powder and shot so necessary for the defense of the fort,¹¹ even on his departure from the place,

¹¹ Dubuisson to Vaudreuil, June 15, 1712, *Ibid.*, 542.

but he put it in the hands of his man Roy for selling, where it remained in diminished amounts until the following year when it had to be used to prevent the complete destruction of the fort by the attacking Indians. Needless to add to the above obvious facts, Dubuisson and Laforest, in spite of their attempted friendly settlement, became "enemies" and oppressors in Cadillac's mind.

One other way of crippling Dubuisson and Detroit lay open. He could take with him some of the men, if they could settle their affairs and leave no debts at Detroit. As a newly appointed governor he could claim that his person should be guarded en route, all in the cause of "the service of the king." He tried to find an escort at Detroit, but was unable to gather a sufficient number of men, because, he said, "they have business ties" in Montreal,¹² and presumably did not want to go to Quebec or New Orleans with Cadillac.— Since there was no escort to protect him he could remain in Detroit, which he did until the spring of 1711.

It will be remembered that Cadillac had said in his previous reports to the governor and to Paris that he had won over all of the tribes of the west to the French cause. In the early months of 1711 Vaudreuil was hurriedly preparing to do just that, unite them against the Iroquois. On March 10, 1711, he wrote elaborate instructions at Montreal for officers and troops whom he was sending to the west to win over the tribes and bring them to Montreal for a meeting with himself.¹³ Sieur d'Argenteuil was chosen as the best man to do the work. Detroit was a key spot in the program, and from the haste and urgency of the mission, appears to have been one of the chief sources of worry for Vaudreuil. It should have been a unifying fort and post. It might be the occasion for the wreck of the French system in the west. All trade was to be stopped and the troops and captains were absolutely forbidden to take any trade articles with them, because if the Indians found that they could trade in the West their trip to Montreal would be delayed or put off.

About the time this expedition was preparing to leave Montreal, Cadillac was preparing to leave Detroit. Precisely when he left and under what circumstances of relief or sorrow he made his farewells is unknown. He arrived in Montreal in early June and the first testimony of his presence there is a memorandum to Vaudreuil, who

¹² See Vaudreuil's memorandum of March 10, 1711, *Ibid.*, 497-502; it must be remembered that Cadillac had said that he had won over all these tribes.

¹³ *Ibid.* and see also the words spoken by Vaudreuil to the Indians when they arrived at Montreal, *Ibid.*, 503-506.

was still there, dated June 5, 1711.¹⁴ Instead of being fearful because of his lack of obedience to the governor and Pontchartrain and for not having settled his Detroit affairs and gone overland to Louisiana, he boldly assumes the offensive and asks for forty men to escort him to Quebec. His reason was the war between the tribes of the West (where there should not have been any war if his previous statements of his pacifications there were true.) Though the French, he says, are not at war with those tribes, the Indians would spare nobody once they were on the war path. The king's service demands that he be given an escort, for he has a numerous family, servants, and belongings. If Vaudreuil has reason for refusing this request, he begs him to send eight men to Detroit to fetch his family to Montreal, bring it to Quebec, and thence embark it for France, "so that I may go wherever His Majesty shall decide."

The memorandum may seem stupid or the writing of a scatterbrain who could not remember that he had in his pocket the orders telling him what His Majesty had already decided. Whatever one judges in this respect, it seems typical of the working of Cadillac's mind. The ruse would give him time in Montreal, for he could say that he was waiting for an answer from Vaudreuil. In the time gained he could get the lay of the land and make plans accordingly. This is exactly what he did.

On June 15 he wrote again to the governor.¹⁵ Again he completely ignores the order to go to Louisiana, but asks Vaudreuil to tell him the "will of His Majesty," admitting for the first time that the governor might know it more exactly than he did. Cadillac wanted the king's mind explained so that he could comply with it, he said. He could not, he states at the end of his petition, take the matter into court. "because no judge knows what His Majesty's intentions are; you alone know them, and you alone can interpret them."¹⁶ What he wanted interpreted (in his own favor, of course) was the letter of Vaudreuil of the preceding September 13, and the clause announcing the king's appointment of Laforest to Detroit "on the same conditions" as those on which Cadillac held it. Cadillac states his case:

¹⁴ Cadillac to Vaudreuil, June 5, 1711, AC C 11E, 15: 45-46.

¹⁵ *Id.* to *Id.*, June 15, 1711, *ibid.*, 48-50, translated in MPHS, 33: 506-508.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* The translation in MPHS, 508, reads: "Because no judge can be informed as to the will of His Majesty; you alone know it and can interpret it." It will be noted that up to this point only Cadillac knew what the will of the king was.

It is therefore necessary, in order to avoid all disputes, and in the interests of the King's service, that you should compel M. de la Forest to accept Detroit on the terms on which I took it over from the company of the colony, by acting in accordance with the letter from the court of 1704 and the contract made with the company on the 28th of September, 1705; or else compel him to abandon his claims to the said Detroit, proposing to order me to hold it myself in the future, as I have done in the past until it shall please Monseigneur to appoint [someone] to it.¹⁷

Is this merely the fantastic workings of the mind of Cadillac or is it a bold invitation on his part asking Vaudreuil to ignore the king's order about Louisiana and Detroit and send Cadillac back to Detroit as proprietor, using some specious pretext for his action? Did not Cadillac know of the sending of d'Argenteuil and the troops to the west? Certainly, he knew Laforest to be old and too ill to go to the post, and it is quite conceivable that he thought Laforest might pass away and thus open up a possibility of reappointment for himself.

Cadillac continues his petition by listing his grievances and losses, mixing true and false and misleading statements for a solid printed page. Dubuisson is put in the position of a robber; he is claiming Cadillac's mill, cattle, and goods for himself, and has stopped Cadillac from receiving rentals and mill fees. He relies on the instructions of Laforest. Neither of the two is willing or able to pay Cadillac for his ownings and contracts. Laforest "enjoys all the revenues and profits of the whole of Detroit, monopolizes the commerce there, forbids and excludes from trading those who have trading rights, and will make no arrangement with me . . ." He begs Vaudreuil to settle the terms immediately and tells the governor what the settlement should be: restrain Laforest from taking Cadillac's possessions and rights (enumerated); make him pay Cadillac in full or make him abandon Detroit; forbid him to disturb Cadillac in his possessions. Apparently, Cadillac wished to sell all things at Detroit at his own price to Laforest and to keep for himself the trade rights. Moreover, he implies that if Laforest cannot go in person to take charge at Detroit, as he could not at the time, the king's appointment would be nullified.

On the following day Vaudreuil replied.¹⁸ He began his letter by showing his displeasure, rebuking Cadillac for not having left for Louisiana in the spring instead of coming to Detroit. "You could have gone there, Sir, and it even appears from several letters which I have received that it was your duty to go to your post." This was

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 506.

¹⁸ Vaudreuil to Cadillac, June 16, 1711, AC, C 11E, 15: 51-52.

clear enough indication of the will of the king. The governor then went to the point of the military escort. It is impossible, he declares, to give the forty men requested, and "I have been informed that you yourself never thought that I would give them." However, and here the governor makes a great concession to get Cadillac on his way, he says: "Although I have received no orders to give you anybody for this [the Louisiana] colony, I will permit twenty men to go . . ." with you from Montreal. If more men are wanted, let Cadillac take them from Detroit, or even let him find Indians who might be willing to go to Louisiana. He added sharply: "You must admit, Sir, that I am doing my best to facilitate your going to your post." He ends by saying that he will permit Cadillac to take men from Fort Pontchartrain, although they are all under the governor's own command.

In his report on the colony made later in 1711, Vaudreuil gave a summary of the Cadillac-Laforest affair to Pontchartrain. He explained how impossible it was for Laforest to reach Detroit in the winter, especially since he had been ill. He had come to Montreal and was making preparations for going to Detroit in June, when Cadillac arrived in Montreal. Vaudreuil then states: "M. de la Mothe, who only came down from that post with the intention of proceeding to France, at once made several proposals to me; but as it is well to be on one's guard with him I told him to put them to me in writing."¹⁹ The written reports were enclosed to Pontchartrain. Then Vaudreuil informs us that Cadillac and Laforest went to Quebec to lay their case before the intendant.

Whether the disputants went together to Quebec or on different dates is unknown. In a statement made at Quebec on July 1, 1711, Cadillac explained how he tried to sell his personal effects to Laforest.²⁰ He was disappointed because Vaudreuil had not decided in his favor and because Raudot had simply handed him back his memorandum. Gone were the days when he felt that he could insult the governor and anybody he pleased in Canada. He had antagonized everybody, had abused their trusts. Now that he was reduced to seeking redress from them, he found no backers. To him they seemed to be taking Laforest's part.

In the long memorandum he recounts again his claims and the history of the events. When Dubuisson enjoined him not to use or dispose of his own property on January 17, he wrote to him asking

¹⁹ Report of Vaudreuil on the Condition of the Colony, Sept. 8, (signed Nov. 7), 1711, MPHS, 33: 530.

²⁰ Declaration of Cadillac, July 1, 1711, *Ibid.*, 508.

him to produce the money for the transfer or some security; he also asked for a copy of the order of the king which dispossessed him. He protested again on April 15. He presented a memorandum to the governor in Montreal on June 16. The governor replied on June 18, that Laforest was in charge of Detroit on the same terms as those in which Cadillac had held it.²¹ If there was any dispute the intendant was to settle it and if he did not do so the matter was to be referred to the minister. Therefore, he says, he went to Quebec, presented his case to Raudot, who had returned his memorandum to him without any judgment telling him to "see Pontchartrain." Then he offered Laforest his properties for either cash or securities. Laforest said that he had no money. Cadillac told him that he would give him time, but Laforest said that he already had large debts and could get no security or loans. Cadillac then wished to sell all his belongings to anybody, but Laforest opposed this (presumably because he and not Cadillac was in charge of Detroit and its properties.) Laforest then drew up terms of the sale and settlement. Now, he was compelled to sign this to avoid complete loss of his efforts. He closes by saying that he considers this signature and the whole transaction invalid because of the duress, and any future signing by him will be under compulsion and therefore invalid.

Two days after thus declaring that all agreements between himself and his successor would be null and void, on July 3, he made his pact with Laforest.²² They signed it before intendant Antoine-Denis Raudot in Quebec. According to the intendant's draft of the contract, "my said M. de la Mothe and my said M. de la Forest" consented to have two officers of Vaudreuil's choice sent to Detroit to assume command there in Cadillac's absence. Trade at Detroit would be carried on with Cadillac taking the profits, except on such articles as Laforest had sent to Dubuisson, until the arrival of the ships from France the following year, at which time the differences between the two would have been settled by Pontchartrain. Cadillac was to get the income from the property but he was to pay for the upkeep. Raudot considered it was best to leave the decision to Paris, declaring "it would be rash to interpret the intentions of the minister."

If anyone thought that this ended the troubles, he quickly found out his mistake. Within eleven days the litigants were back in

²¹ *Ibid.*, 509.

²² Agreement made between MM. de Lamothe and Laforest, July 3, 1711, *Ibid.*, 510-512.

Montreal, where an occasion immediately arose whereby Cadillac could resume his badgering of Vaudreuil. On July 14, 1711, Laforest wrote to the governor for permission to go to Detroit.²³ He had heard from some Frenchmen recently arrived from Detroit that in that place "all is in a state of conflagration." The savages and the allies, he heard, were warring and killing each other each day. He felt that his presence there was necessary and begged permission to go at once. The agreement he had made with La Mothe, he said, was conditional, in that it was "made at a time when we were both at liberty to think that all would be quiet at Detroit." The king's service took precedence over all.

As soon as Cadillac heard from Vaudreuil of this new development, he sat down and wrote an indignant protest, which was dated July 16.²⁴ "As you did not wish, Sir, to take cognizance of what concerns my interests and those of M. de la Forest . . . and sent us to the Intendant," he argued, we adopted an agreement. All Vaudreuil had to do about it was to approve the nomination of officers and the command. Notwithstanding all this, you are sending Laforest to Detroit. "You hold all authority," he goes on, and we must obey you. But do not let him trade, he begged. Clearly, Cadillac wanted the governor to distinguish between the command of the fort and the trade of the country, and since he did not trust anybody, he asked Vaudreuil to send one Marigny as a co-commander with Laforest and as one invested with all the rights and prerogatives that had been given to himself.

He went on to say that Vaudreuil could not judge about the agreement, because he would have nothing to do with it thus far, and that if Laforest wanted to go to Detroit he would have first to return to Quebec to get a decision from Raudot.

I do not think the said M. de la Forest can return [to Detroit], in the face of his signature; he is not a minor, nor under the care of a guardian. Hence our agreement must hold; and, if he wishes now to go to Detroit because of his honor, why did he not entertain this same sentiment ten or twelve days ago, when the said agreement was made; his honor, then, must have been asleep for the time. And since he declared himself in his said agreement to be unable to make the journey to Detroit on account of bad health which he did not expect to be re-established until next year, by what miracle does he find himself healed in a week, so much better than for nearly a year, since the time he had his orders to go to his post, but has not set about repairing there; yet he has been going and coming elsewhere as he does now.²⁵

²³ Laforest to Vaudreuil, July 14, 1711, *Ibid.*, 512.

²⁴ Cadillac to Vaudreuil, July 16, 1711, *Ibid.*, 513-515.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 514.

Cadillac's closing paragraph is astounding:

And in case, Sir, should you refuse me the just favors I ask from you, which are to enjoy the profit of my agreement of the third of this month made with M. de la Forest, permit me to abandon Detroit to you [with] all my property in general that I possess at the said place, being unable to act otherwise as I am compelled to yield to your authority, hoping that His Majesty will have regard to the great loss I am sustaining and will provide means of compensating me.

Cadillac must have known that if Vaudreuil were to accept this offer, he could later sue the governor when the decision came from Paris, for Detroit had been given by the king to Laforest, not to Vaudreuil. He asks for "just favors" in one line and later says that he is being forced to give his Detroit to Vaudreuil. Is he threatening Vaudreuil with the wrath of His Majesty for the great loss he is sustaining either because Vaudreuil will not do anything about the settlement or is compelling him to turn over his goods?

The governor did not fall into the trap. He merely handed the letter over to Laforest who replied to it the following day, July 17.²⁶ He says sanely, that the wars have put Detroit in a bad way; when the intendant hears of this he will want me there, since I am the appointed commander, and he will pay no attention to the agreement. "As I am going to develop that post and as it is necessary for me to bear whatever expense is connected with its exploitation, M. de Lamothe should not take it into his head that I shall let him carry on trading there. He need not think he will impress anyone by specious arguments, which he is using only to perpetuate his hold on Detroit." And as for Cadillac's goods he can send any clerk he thinks fit to sell them.

As for his honor, Laforest says that it may have been asleep, but in the situation of honor three years ago Cadillac himself was asleep; Laforest is willing to risk his life by going into the danger zone; the critical situation at Detroit certainly awakened him to his honor. It was not the same with that of M. de la Mothe three years ago when he, with four hundred men, was besieging sixty or eighty savages, Miamis, in a wretched little fort; for as soon as he came up to this fort, he entrenched himself behind a very big tree where he remained always asleep, in spite of the constant discharge of musket shots which went on for a very long time on both sides until the savages had hoisted a white flag on their palisade and asked to speak."²⁷

²⁶ La Forest to Vaudreuil, July 17, 1711, *Ibid.*, 515-517.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 516.

Vaudreuil commented: "But as I saw that this was going on forever, I referred them both to the Intendant to decide their dispute regarding the trade."²⁸ As to the command, he granted Laforest's request to go to Detroit. But Vaudreuil did not believe that the trade of the post could be separated from the command and he was certain that the intendant felt the same. Paris could decide the issue.

Laforest did not go to Detroit after all, for Ramézay, the governor of Montreal, made him stop there with his two lighters and twelve men, because Walker and his fleet were on their way to attack Quebec.²⁹ In a letter to Pontchartrain, Laforest is said to have asked Cadillac the pertinent question, who would pay for the upkeep of Detroit, seeing that he wished to have the commerce of the post. Cadillac had no answer to give. The king certainly would not pay, and Cadillac did not want to foot the bill. Moreover, until the time of his leaving Detroit, he had always found excuses for not paying the soldiers, or the missionary, or the interpreter, or the surgeon. He had tried to impose the burden of payment on the inhabitants. Actually, he was now repudiating his debts and had no intention of paying, now that he was going to Louisiana. In the margin of this letter is the following annotation by Pontchartrain which settled the future trade and command: "He Laforest must have the trade at the post if he wants the commandantship."³⁰

Toward the end of July or the beginning of August, Cadillac returned to Quebec. While he was there, an inventory of his property was taken at Detroit, and everything was placed in the custody of Pierre Roy. The inventory was completed and signed on August 25, 1711, by the Recollect missionary, Fray Chérubin Deniaux.³¹ On the preceding day Father Chérubin wrote a letter to Cadillac telling him of the terrible conditions at Detroit. According to this, all order and subordination were gone. Dubuisson had cut the fort in half and turned Madame de la Mothe, and himself, and six chief families out of the dwelling, and the interpreter and surgeon. Du-

²⁸ Report of Vaudreuil (as n. 19 above), 530. In his account of the dispute the governor clearly indicates that he has given the king's orders to Cadillac and has told him to go to Louisiana overland; he washes his hands of Cadillac by saying: "Since he is going to France with his family, he will have the honor of stating to you himself the reasons which prevented him from proceeding to his governorship overland." *Ibid.*, 531.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Laforest was stopped "because his going would have served many of the savages with a pretext for disbanding."

³⁰ Laforest to Pontchartrain, Nov. 10, 1711, AC C 11A. 32: 255v, 257v.

³¹ The inventory is dated August 25, 1711, and is in MPH, 33: 518-528. Another copy, kept in Quebec, is translated in MPHS, 34: 267 ff. and the original French of this is in *Bulletin des recherches historiques*, 22 (1918): 19 ff.

buisson acts as though he is "infallible, invulnerable, and invincible."³²

The inventory made by Chesne and Magnant, assisted by Friar Chérubin, recommends itself as a model for detail. The inventory-ists did everything but count the number of grains of wheat. In fact, when they finished with their description of all of the effects of Detroit, one could almost draw a picture of the post and what it contained. They apparently did their best to make the list as long as possible so that Cadillac might be able to justify his claim that his properties were worth thirty thousand livres. But at the same time they made remarks to indicate that some of the items were worth nothing. They not only itemized doors but the hinges and the number of bolts holding them. They begin with the mill and end up with "An old tin basin weighing 3#."

"A mill of wood, about thirty-four feet high and thirty feet eight inches in diameter with all its rigging except the sail-cloths which are worth nothing." So begins the inventory. A year before this the said mill was described thus: "the mill has been struck by lightening three times this summer, which has damaged it severely, bad as it was before."³³ The other valuable assets in the mill were: two cables, 46# of plaster, an iron S-piece, a crow-bar, three hammers, a hatchet, an axe, a sieve, one half minot, and three bolts, nothing more.

The buildings were nine in number and in no wise impressive. First was the much spoken of warehouse, thirty-seven and a half by twenty-two feet by eight feet high, roofed and floored with wood but with siding only two feet up. Four houses are described, all of stakes with grass roofs and apparently without wood floors. The first, thirty-three and a half by nineteen by eight feet, had window shutters, a door, a small cellar nearby, and a porch; the second house was eighteen by twelve by six and a half feet, with shutters, door, and an adjoining cellar; the third was rated "inferior," being sixteen by twelve, without door or window, and serving as a cattle shed; apparently it had no roof; the fourth was thirty-three by twenty-one by nine feet, with spaces for but no doors or shutters. The barn was fifty by twenty-seven by eleven, with "joists partly worn out." A year previously this and the "house" mentioned above were called "a miserable barn and house, which serves as a stable."³⁴

³² Chérubin to Cadillac, August 24, 1711, MPHS, 33: 517. The editor spelled the Franciscan's name "De Nian" but the signature at the end of the inventory is Deniaux.

³³ See Census of Detroit for 1710, *Ibid.*, 494-495.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 494.

The seventh and eighth "buildings" listed are one dove-cote and one ice-house. The last was the "church", thirty-five by twenty-four and a half by ten feet, a log cabin with a roof, doors, windows and shutters, a key, and a bell. Architecturally there seems nothing of importance here, since the skyscraper was an eleven foot barn.

The ornaments of the church are next listed, although for what reason is not clear, since the vestments, altar, and so forth must have been blest and could not be sold; the other items in the two-page list, like "two pin-cushions," "eight bunches of artificial flowers, old & worn out," some flower pots, one confessional, and one old "turning box," could certainly claim no attention at an auction.

Next follow lists headed Joiners tools, Carpenter's Tools, and Mason's tools, ending up with: "An anvil, bent. A hammer, bent." Among the mason's tools we find a small inkstand, a pair of iron handcuffs, and eight hinges "which have seen service."

The merchandise about which there was so much dispute is listed in three full pages. There were dozens of knives classified under nine headings. Hinges, fire-beaters, large fishing hooks, tongs, screws, crucifixes, rosaries, needles, aniseseed, small trumpets, calumets, beads, mirrors, wooden combs, beads, horse hair buttons, alum, threads (one spool "a little eaten by mice" and some gold thread "spoilt"), ribbons, gun flints, sixteen muskets (five of which were poor or spoilt), women's shirts, small shirts (some worn and some worn out), cloths, "two pairs of fine stockings for a man," lead, bullets, a medicine chest, a set of steps, cable, a soldier's coat, a wooden trunk, a bracelet, two necklaces, some dishes, two locks, a door, a large pirogue, an oven, some bags, and flour, such make up the main entrees on the list.

The animals were four oxen, thirteen bulls from one to four years old, two heifers a year old and one four years old, nine large cows, and "1 horse called Colin, 8 years old or thereabouts." Under the heading of harness for the horse called Colin we find a plow and chain, "an old curry comb," a drag cart, a wheel cart, an ox wagon, and "Also 1 feather bed with its bolster," and nineteen pigeons! Colin might be called a "compleat" horse.

There is added the list of effects and tools for M. Demarigny, which Pierre Roy was holding for Cadillac, and this consists chiefly of household goods and pantry supplies, though there was a quantity of powder, shot, lead, and gun flints. Among the items are two spits, a couch, nine chairs, two frying pans "half worn out," a tin funnel, four bottles, twelve tin plates, an old tin tankard, four ounces

of pepper, cloves, nutmegs, and "4 dishes of different kinds, one with the edge cracked, weighing three livres and a half." Since the weight is given the dishes probably were of plate.

What became of all of these properties and supplies cannot be told, but some are accounted for. When the savages, aroused by the Fox, began their assaults on Fort Pontchartrain in May of 1712, they killed most of the pigeons and the stock of the settlers. Dubuisson realizing that the Indians were out of control, says:

But the most important matter was to pull down, as quickly as possible, the church, the store-house, and any other building alongside of my fort, which was also so near [to their fort] that the enemy would have had it in their power to set our buildings on fire whenever they wished; and moreover it was a matter of importance to make some clearance so that we might defend ourselves better in case we were attacked, which in fact happened.³⁵

The materials were used to strengthen the fort. The dove-cote was also put to a good purpose. The Indians wanted it, so Dubuisson had it moved and set up on its stilts opposite to their fort. Then, before they were aware of what was going on, he had two swivel guns mounted and trained on their fort through two loop holes of the six foot coop.³⁶ We wonder what Cadillac, who constructed the buildings, would have done under the circumstances. The powder and shot were taken for the defence of the fort, and later on paid for. Again, it must be noted, if Cadillac had arranged peace between the tribes as he had been bound to do, the whole bloodshed, including the deaths of eight hundred Fox, might have been averted.³⁷

Father Marest, reporting the words of the Indians, in the middle of 1712, quotes them as saying: "In a short time from now, another French chief Sabrevois is to come, who is a young man who has bought all the property of Monsieur de La Mothe, his silver plate, his oxen & cows, &c., and has also bought the land of Detroit, &c."³⁸ Did the &c. include Colin, the horse? Later we find Sabrevois accusing Alphonse Tonti of eating the oxen and cows,³⁹ which were probably aged on the hoof by that time. Since Cadillac made no further claim for payment for his goods and since he did make claims of 300# for the cattle, it is assumed that Sabrevois had already paid for the goods. There remained only the settlements for the con-

³⁵ Report of Dubuisson to Vaudreuil, June 15, 1712, *Ibid.*, 538.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 539.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 551, and Marest to Vaudreuil, June 21, 1712, *Ibid.*, 555.

³⁸ Marest to Vaudreuil, July 6, 1712, *Ibid.*, 557.

³⁹ Sabrevois to Cadillac, (1717?), *Ibid.*, 595.

tracts, but over these and the rents, and his pay, Cadillac was to argue for the next ten years.

What he did about the inventory when it reached him is not stated. It must have seemed satisfactory to him or there would be correspondence. He was sufficiently interested in getting to France, though it was clear that he would be disobeying orders in so doing rather than in going overland to Louisiana. His legal claims would be some excuse for getting to France, where he could risk explaining his disobedience to Pontchartrain. That the long war was still dragging on was no concern of his. That there might be some angles of profit in Louisiana to be investigated in Paris was of some concern.

So to France he went. We have no information as to the time when Cadillac's family arrived at Quebec; all that we know is that they were supposed to reach there in September. We also know that on November 12 he was still in Quebec, for on this day he bestowed a dowry of six thousand livres on his daughter Judith, who was to stay at the Ursuline convent as a perpetual boarder.⁴⁰ The contract drawn for her is remarkable, because first she was to be left in Canada and second because of the perpetual care she was to receive. She was about twenty-three years of age. From these facts and the elaborate contract we could conclude that she was handicapped in some fashion. Three of his thirteen children had died, and one, born at Detroit in 1710, was buried at Quebec in 1714; no reason is given why this four year old was left behind.⁴¹ An older son, Antoine, remained and was in the Indian wars in 1716. Incidentally, two of his children were born in 1707, one on January 19, the other on December 28. Cadillac and *some* of his family must have left for France shortly after November 12, 1711.⁴²

⁴⁰ "Contract and agreement between the reverend ladies Ursulines and Mon. de la mothe Cadillac," Nov. 12, 1711, MPHS, 34: 250-254.

⁴¹ See C. M. Burton in *Ibid.*, 303-304 on the progeny of Cadillac. Regarding Antoine, the eldest son, see Burton's comments, 317-318, wherein the editor speaks of the "rascals" who despoiled Cadillac and the application of young Cadillac for the Detroit post; this son was claiming a vast tract of land around Detroit, and was "deprived" of it; Vaudreuil and the intendant turned down the application, because "La Mothe's son has not had experience enough to rule the minds of the savages."

⁴² Cadillac to Pontchartrain, April 7, 1712, AC, C 13A, 2: 668. According to this *coup de partance* was fired on November 12 at four in the morning, but he was signing the above mentioned contract in Quebec in the afternoon of the same day, he must be mistaken about the time of departure.

II. Louisiana Fiasco

The date of the arrival of the Cadillac family on the shores of France is unknown. At the end of January, 1712 the Congress of Utrecht had opened for the series of meetings which in the course of two years ended the war. The first indication that Cadillac had made his way to Paris is his letter to Pontchartrain dated April 7, 1712 and written "à l'hôtel de Beauvais, rue de l'Hirondelle," where he stayed during his sojourn.⁴³

In the first paragraph he admits that his letter "is somewhat long, but reading it, you will have more merit before God. *Qui studet orat.*" He goes on to explain that he was not obliged to give a gratuity to Laforest,* whose high-handed procedures along with those of Dubuisson he protests. Three famous lawyers of the Parlement of Paris have answered that what Alphonse Tonti had received was not a gratuity but a salary, and he was not bound to pay any salary to the said gentlemen. He explains that he does not want to have this matter judged at Quebec, where everybody is related to Laforest or to his wife. Moreover, such bickerings do not become an officer, and he cannot give power of attorney to anybody in Canada, for no one would dare go to court for Cadillac in a place where "the man who has all authority in Canada [Vaudreuil] is my irreconcilable enemy." Presuming that Pontchartrain was either stupid or gullible he continued with a few facts: he did not do any trading at Detroit; all in all he may have made 50,000 livres profit. His son had come back with him on leave of absence from Vaudreuil, but illness had prevented his visiting the minister. Cadillac would like to go to Louisiana, if the minister's intention still is that he should go.

He soon became more and more interested in getting to Louisiana, for plans were being talked of in Paris, which might open the way to large profits. Antoine Crozat, the big financier of the time, was interested in investing some of his reputedly vast fortune in a trade monopoly in Louisiana. The interest in the trade was second to the interest in mines, about which so many references were being made in the letters from the court to colonial administrators and *vice-versa*. Here was business likely to interest Cadillac.

Crozat and Lebar were considering the offer of Louis XIV for the venture. As part of the investigation, Raudot, who had returned to Paris from Canada, called in Cadillac for an interview with Lebar.

⁴³ Cadillac to Pontchartrain, April 7, 1712, AC, C 13A, 2: 669-670.

Lebar, however, did not appear; "he sent word," Cadillac wrote to Pontchartrain, "that he had been occupied the whole day with some important business," but some time later questioned Cadillac about the mines of Louisiana.⁴⁴ "I answered him that I was absolutely sure there was a rich lead mine." Last year, he went on to say, the Foxes had brought in two prisoners, whose village was near the Spanish mines. These braves Cadillac had entertained for three months, and before he sent them back they had given him a plan of their country. If Pontchartrain will be so kind as to give him a quarter of an hour of his time, Cadillac will explain everything. Cadillac, therefore, posed as one having the key to the plan of the court and Cruzat.

Parenthetically, we have an idea of the governor-elect's talk and conduct during this time. Tremblay—who, as will be remembered, had warned Bishop Laval and the Priests of the Séminaire of Quebec against Cadillac—wrote two letters of the same date from Paris to M. Glandelet, the vicar-general of the Bishop of Quebec. In the second of these he mentions having seen Cadillac and his whole family several times. He is, says Tremblay, a witty man, and is very judicious in refusing the Jesuits a house in Mobile, though by so doing against the urgent appeal of Father de Lamberville, he said that he had incurred the displeasure of the minister.⁴⁵ After a paragraph dealing with other matters, Tremblay continues as follows:

M. the governor of Louisiana came to see me after I had written the above. He told me that M. de Pontchartrain had granted the monopoly of trade in that country to M. Crozat. He thinks a ship will leave for Louisiana toward the end of next September.

He is at present well received by M. de Pontchartrain, and is resolved to grant the Jesuits only a warehouse where they can have a brother to receive their provisions.

⁴⁴ Cadillac to Pontchartrain, May 2, 1712, AC, C 13A, 2: 671-673v.

⁴⁵ "That if it objected that the petitioner [Cadillac], when he came to France, ought to have obtained redress through M. de Pontchartrain, he replies that this minister was so biased against him by secret intrigues which cannot be explained (unless he is ordered to do so), that Pontchartrain indulged in fits of anger which, at the time, caused some sensation in Versailles." Cadillac to the Comte de Toulouse, Admiral of France, Head of the Council of the Navy, 1720, MPHS, 33: 657. Thus, Cadillac admits driving even the minister into fits of anger. Pontchartrain probably was most irritated at his disobedience in not going to Louisiana. Cadillac openly admits in this same letter to Toulouse (p. 650) that "he was forbidden to come to France, not merely until his post was established, but also until after peace was concluded, and not even to go there without orders." This he actually proves by two letters dated June 7, 1705, and June 6, 1708. Since he was "in the service" it remains an utter mystery how he was not court-martialled and how he ever with his record got any consideration let alone a position in the government.

He told M. de Lorme and me that he intended to give the king 1,200,000 livres on condition that he receives 200,000 livres for himself. The million which the king will receive will serve to pay the card-money of Canada and the letters of exchange drawn on the royal treasury... He claims that his plan will infallibly succeed, and that if it is not accepted, Canada will be irretrievably lost. He is certainly very witty and is very ingenious. If anybody can establish Louisiana, he is the man.⁴⁶

Regarding the information about the Crozat monopoly, this had not yet been signed. Pontchartrain changed his mind about the Jesuits having a house in Mobile because pressure to this effect had caused the king to limit their activity to the Illinois country. We do not know the details of Cadillac's scheme for making the million livres for the king, but whatever it was his projects had no appeal for either Crozat or his majesty.

In the same month of June, 1712, Cadillac wrote to Pontchartrain from Paris that he had given a memoir to Crozat. According to this memoir, he extended the boundaries of the colony of Louisiana so as to include the Wabash (that is, the Ohio River), the Illinois and the Sioux country. This would include all of the area rumored to have mines, though Cadillac had only the haziest notions about the extent of Louisiana. He seems to have felt the need of explaining his inaccuracy, always with an eye to pleasing the court and the powerful Crozat. "I must admit, my Lord, that I put these things in my memoir [to Crozat], but I beg your Highness to remember that I did this in order to engage him to take up Louisiana as you seemed to desire."⁴⁷ And in his letter of the following August to Pontchartrain, he is still more specific:

M. Crozat is not alone in this undertaking. According to your wish, and thanks to my exertions, he and others have an absorbing interest in the commercial possibilities of that country. I have given him a memoir and have spoken to him of the immense riches of Louisiana, of its mines of gold and silver, of its pearls, of its minerals.⁴⁸

Antoine Crozat, Marquis de Châtel, banker, merchant, art collector, was given the monopoly of trade in Louisiana on September 14, 1712, which was to terminate in fifteen years, but he reckoned little on Cadillac's ability to aid in ending the grant within three years with a loss of some quarter of a million livres. Cadillac on his part very soon found out just how small he was to be in the general program. The king specified very clearly what his duties were to be

⁴⁶ Tremblay to Glandelet, June 15, 1712, Archives of the Séminaire of Quebec (Laval University), Lettres, Carton O, p. 17.

⁴⁷ Cadillac to Pontchartrain, June 29, 1712, AC, C 13A, 2: 676.

⁴⁸ *Id.* to *Id.*, August 14, 1712, *ibid.*, 688.

in a long supplementary memoir sealed at Versailles on December 18, 1712.⁴⁹ This changed substantially and supplemented minor details of Cadillac's instructions at the time of his appointment May 13, 1710.

Crozat was to control all commerce for fifteen years and all mines were to become his and his heirs' property. Cadillac was to obey Crozat, protect and aid his agents in finding mines, establishing factories and in agriculture. The details must have been harrowing to Cadillac. He was to see that ten marriageable girls arrived with each ship, encourage colonists, stop and prevent libertinism, maintain union and peace, and live in harmony with Sieur Jean Baptiste Duclos, the appointed Commissary General. Worst of all, Duclos was to have charge of the purse strings and all the king's funds. This made Cadillac a commander of some sixty soldiers, a policeman, a superintendant of buildings, and a judge, which was not the ideal he had of himself. Moreover: "His Majesty charges him again to give an example to the inhabitants in everything that may attract to religion the veneration and devotion that all ought to have for it and to inspire the officers, the soldiers and the inhabitants of the colonies to do so since they need the example of their superiors . . ."

Duclos received his corresponding orders the same day.⁵⁰ The chief innovation was the establishment of a Superior Council to judge civil and criminal cases. This was to be composed of Cadillac, Governor; Duclos, First Councillor; Bienville, the King's Lieutenant; and three others including an attorney general who were to be selected conjointly by Cadillac and Duclos. Two other special memoirs were given to Duclos, and these with the preceding ordered him especially to write reports on the conduct of affairs and any violations of the trade prohibitions.⁵¹

When everything was ready, Cadillac, his family, and *Commissaire Ordonnateur* Duclos went to La Rochelle and embarked on the *Baron de la Fauche*. After a brief stop at Brest, they sailed on March 18, reached Santo Domingo on April 29, and finally arrived at Dauphine Island, formerly Massacre Island, in Mobile Bay on June 5, 1713.⁵²

⁴⁹ Louis XIV to Cadillac, Dec. 18, 1712, Versailles, translation of Albert G. Sanders in *The Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XV (October, 1932), 592-598.

⁵⁰ Royal Instructions for Duclos, Dec. 18, 1712, *Ibid.*, 598-607.

⁵¹ King to Duclos, Dec. 24, 1712, and Pontchartrain to Duclos, Jan. 28, 1713, *Ibid.*, 607-609.

⁵² Duclos to Pontchartrain, March 15, 1713, AC, C 13A, 3: 97, and another letter of May 3, 1713, *ibid.*, 109, and Cadillac to Pontchartrain, October 26, 1713, *ibid.*, 1, give this data on the journey.

Anyone wishing to find out how the time was passed during the journey will have interesting reading in the long reports of Duclos, who, within six months of his arrival begged Pontchartrain to recall him, "because it is impossible for me to be able to live on good terms with Mr. De Lamothe Cadillac who is too crafty for me."⁵³ He then explains the "tricks" of Mr. De Lamothe. Cadillac's appointment three years before put him in charge of the funds, and he hoped to make up his Detroit losses (now more than 45,000 livres) in Louisiana. He had stated publicly more than once that Pontchartrain was responsible. Now, he had taken an aversion to Duclos because he was the purser. During the voyage he constantly tried to impress Duclos that it was

"dangerous to quarrel with him because he had a superior mind . . . 'I have have seen myself opposed,' he used to say to me very often, 'by the intendant, the Governor General of Canada, the bishop, priests, curates, Jesuits and in short by everybody; I have quarrelled with M. De Champigny, M. Beauharnais, M. Raudot even, and I have always accomplished everything that I have undertaken, in spite of them all and in spite of everybody, and that by the strength of my character. My lord the Count de Pontchartrain told me so again recently when I was in Paris. 'Mr. De Lamothe, I am very much displeased with you but I cannot refrain from telling you that you have a superior mind, that you are a great officer and that I have never seen anything so well written as your letters.' . . .

He appeared to me in fact a very dangerous man not because of the superiority of his mind which I did not find superior except where his interest was concerned and very limited when anything else was concerned, but because I saw that he must really be a very uneasy and very restless man, . . . and furthermore because I saw in all the other talk that he uttered that he was one of the boldest liars that I have ever seen, and it is certain that a man as selfish as he is and at the same time as uneasy, restless and having no scruple to give out boldly as true the very things that are directly the most contrary to the truth, is always a man very much to be feared no matter what attention one may give not to deviate at all from his desire.⁵⁴

The colony was in a sad condition, and Cadillac did what he could to make it worse. By July he had refused some flour to the starving colonists and had forced Duclos to give forty-five barrels of the garrison's supply to the Spanish governor of Pensacola.⁵⁵

⁵³ Duclos to Pontchartrain, October, 1713, AC, C 13A, 3: 149-195, translated by Professor Saunders in *The Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XVII, (April, 1934), 269.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 271-272.

⁵⁵ Duclos to Pontchartrain, July 10, 1713, MPA, II, 75-76. Cadillac seems to have been justified in establishing friendly relations with the Spanish governors in the towns in and around the Gulf of Mexico, though his first duty was to organize the French colony as a center. Duclos states, (*Ibid.*, 89) "The intention and sole purpose of this Company is—one cannot doubt this—to find some way to establish a regular commerce with the in-

Then he demanded a house in the fort from Duclos, who had no authority for giving him one. He discouraged all of the inhabitants by saying publicly that the colony would definitely have to be abandoned. Then he went on a visit to Pensacola.

In his own account of his doings written in October he ended by saying: "I have been sick unto death for three months. Only for a week have I been somewhat convalescent. I do not understand how one can suffer so much without dying."⁵⁶ For one so sick he had moved around quite a bit, as his interminable report shows. Everything was wrong with Mobile; the fort was useless and might be washed away by the sea or blown away by a hurricane. There are no trees or rocks to repair it; the wheat does not grow; the fruit is no good; the tobacco is filled with vermin; the people are "a heap of the dregs of Canada, jailbirds . . . addicted to vice . . ."; there are no copper mines, but there are gold and silver mines in the land; "the officers who are here know absolutely nothing about the service; the people of the colony sell poultry and fresh supplies to the Spaniards because they pay a better price; the soldiers have tried to desert; there are no individuals suitable for the council, which has not been established; "If God grants me health I shall try to restore this colony which is not worth a straw at the present time." These are some of the items. On the personal side, he asked for his salary for the years 1711 and 1712, "although you ordered the commissary not to pay it because I was absent from my government."

Going in the same mail bag was Duclos' report and letter cited previously, asking to be recalled because of the tricks of Cadillac, and a letter of Cadillac to Crozat.⁵⁷ Crozat was informed by the governor of the very bad conditions of the colony and of the possibility of raising silkworms "unless the thunder which is very frequent there [in Louisiana] is unfavorable to silkworms." Cadillac did not think commerce could be carried on at the Spanish ports, but he did think the trade rules could be circumvented by trading at

habitants of Old or New Mexico." Duclos knew that there was no possibility of commerce with Pensacola, which was as badly off as Dauphine Island, or with Vera Cruz because of the strict port rules; he saw possibilities in Matagorda Bay as a port of entry that might be explored for possible trade and contact with the Santa Barbara mining area of upper Mexico, and thus was following the scheme of La Salle of 1684-1685. Duclos finished a report to Pontchartrain on October 13, 1713, which must have taken most of the five months to compose. It runs from p. 79 to 162 as printed in MPA, II. Cadillac's report follows this, 162-204, and cannot compare with it in details or analysis of the situation.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 179.

⁵⁷ Abstract of Letter of Cadillac to Crozat, October, 1713, MPA, III, 175.

New Mexico and so had sent St. Denis up the Red River. Cadillac also mentions the possibility of trade opened up by Fray Francisco Hidalgo, who was interested in the Spanish missions of Texas.⁵⁸ Cleverest of all his tricks was to accuse Duclos and Bienville of trading for the king in competition to Crozat's agents. In fact, he called for very vigorous regulations to prevent everybody from trading and asked to send Bienville to Biloxi to remove him from every opportunity of commerce. The superior intellect of Cadillac was characterized, as reading the entire correspondence will prove, by an ability in the policy of trimming; constantly he told one person or official some damning story about another and thus engineered serious dissensions and personal dislikes. Thus analyzing him Duclos proved himself quite a judge of men.

While the sober and legalistic Duclos took Cadillac seriously, supposing probably that shrewd men like the king, the minister, and the financier knew what they were doing in making such an appointment, a fairly rash supposition, Bienville judged him by what he did and said and came to the conclusion that Cadillac was an ass. His scheme of trading via New Mexico appeared to Bienville as silly; in fact his whole idea of commerce was useless in view of the few inhabitants of Louisiana.⁵⁹ Bienville laughed at him when Cadillac arrested him and sent him to his house for a day.⁶⁰ It became evident, however, to Bienville during the course of the next year and a half that Cadillac, fool or malicious intriguer no matter which, was a dangerous man. In a series of reports he states the reasons, which are too numerous to give here in detail and only confirm all that has been said about Cadillac's plotting.⁶¹ The series of events leading to the governor's recall starts when Crozat and the gay minister began to believe some of the very many of complaints against him.

Cadillac went north to the Illinois country to look for silver mines

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 176. For a documentary account of Hidalgo and the St. Denis trip of 1714 see Carlos E. Castañeda, *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, 1519-1936*, Volume II, *The Winning of Texas*, 24-32.

⁵⁹ Abstract of Bienville's letter, MPA, III, 178.

⁶⁰ Cadillac to Pontchartrain, May 16, 1714, *Ibid.*, 178-180. This is one of the most childish of all Cadillac's writings.

⁶¹ Bienville to Pontchartrain, June 15, 1715, *Ibid.*, 181 ff. Cadillac left for the north without telling anybody or giving Bienville orders. The latter found out he was gone a week after his departure (186), and two months later Bienville got orders and the information that Cadillac "was going to the Illinois country." Northern Indians came to Bienville to tell him that "all the nations had received the English because of the bad reception that M. de Lamothe had given them and that they had declared that they did not wish to have anything to do with the French as long as M. de Lamothe was here..." (187) Cadillac remained away for eight months, (191).

in the spring of 1715.⁶² By the end of that year the Indians of the whole Mississippi Valley were either turbulent or at war, particularly the Cherokees and the Kaskaskias. Bienville noted in January, 1716: "It seems that Mr. de Lamothe has inspired war in all the nations established on the St. Louis River. That will not fail to defer greatly the establishments that your Lordship orders me to go and make on that river [the Mississippi], unless I am well supplied with men."⁶³ In that same month Cadillac was blandly reporting that all was quiet in the colony since his return.⁶⁴ There remains only one clique which he has to break up: Bienville, Boisbriant, a major, two captains, an adjutant and an ensign, are named first, and later he adds Duclos and Raujan. Twenty one men had deserted, he says, through the fault of Bienville, and four others deserted later and went to Pensacola. He thinks, the notes continue, that the clerk deserves to be hanged, and he has appointed *Sieur de la Tour* major, but he "talks of nothing but killing and hanging without reason."⁶⁵ Thus, all seemed quiet.

All such deeds were revealing and alarming to the ministry and Crozat. In February, 1716, a note to a memoir presented to the *Conseil de Marine* which was now in charge of the colonies, says that is necessary above all "to replace MM. de Lamothe and Duclos by more capable administrators."⁶⁶ On March 1, Crozat proposed L'Espinay to take Cadillac's place,⁶⁷ and two days later the order of recall and the appointment of L'Espinay were issued, though it was October before the new governor received his instructions and the old one his order to return.⁶⁸ Duclos remained until the Crozat monopoly was terminated.

Meantime, on July 1, Cadillac wrote to the *Conseil*: "The colony of Louisiana is a monster that has no form of government."⁶⁹ He did not know that Crozat already knew this and blamed it all upon Cadillac. Crozat, the note reads,

agrees that the colony is in horrible disorder but that is the result of the disunion that Mr. De Lamothe has brought into it and of the fact that he was unwilling to execute any orders that were sent him to establish the commerce

⁶² He arrived at Kaskaskia on May 11, 1715; AC, C 13A, 3: 363.

⁶³ Bienville to Raudot, Jan. 20, 1716, MPA, III, 200.

⁶⁴ Minutes of the Council, abstract of Cadillac's letter of Jan. 2, 1716, MPA, II, 209-212.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 217.

⁶⁶ *Memoire sur la Louisiane*, Feb. 8, 1716, AC, C 13A, 4: 30.

⁶⁷ Crozat to Comte de Toulouse, [March 1], 1716, AC C 13A, 4: 1020.

⁶⁸ Council of Marine to L'Espinay, March 3, 1716, AC, B 38: 88, and 326v and Minutes of the Council, October 10, 1716, AM, B 1, 9: 144 ff.

⁶⁹ MPA, II, 219.

of the Mississippi River, and of his bad conduct toward the Indian nations, with all of whom he has found a way to get into a quarrel.

Later in the notes of the council meeting the comments on Cadillac's criticism of the fort read: "It is his fault that he has not put it in a better condition." As to the mine: "Lamothe has done nothing . . . except write about it in very general terms so that it was not from him that the details of it were learned." It apparently had dawned upon the authorities that Cadillac was actually a dangerous man, and from then on his words were to be viewed with suspicion; he was in effect one always talking against the government and one who for his own gains might deal with the Spanish or English or Indians. He might be a spy or traitor.

When the ship bringing L'Espinay arrived in Mobile Bay, in the spring of 1717 Cadillac went on board to pay his respects to the new governor. The same promptly gave orders that his predecessor was not to land again and was to be watched.⁷⁰ Bienville already had command of the handful of troops still remaining. In spite of L'Espinay's orders he must have returned to shore, for he embarked on another ship, the *Paon*, and arrived at La Rochelle "with his whole family," on September 1, 1717.⁷¹ He was out of America forever. His only contribution to the American development was the assumed name Cadillac, which a vast American industry has later made famous.

III. Last Years in France

Things at Versailles had changed, probably for the worse, by the time of the arrival of the Lamothe family in France, on the second anniversary of the death of Louis XIV. Louis XV at the age of seven was too young to know how badly off his country was after the wars. Jean Frédéric Phélypeaux, Comte de Maurepas, had succeeded his father Jérôme Phélypeaux, Comte de Pontchartrain, as secretary of state for the marine or minister of the navy, whichever sounded best. At the ripe young age of fourteen he was twice as old as the king, and was beginning to sparkle as a court wit, following the tastes in frivolity of his father. The sire, after seventeen years service as minister of marine and chief court entertainer, was forced to resign ten days after Louis XIV breathed his last. The Council of the Marine had successfully accused him of completely mismanaging

⁷⁰ Lemaire to, May 28, 1717, Archives of the Séminaire of Quebec, Laval University, Missions, Carton no. 47.

⁷¹ Minutes of the Council of Marine, May 3, 1718, AM, B 1, 29: 434.

naval affairs and of abusing his high position to gather profits for himself.

From La Rochelle Cadillac promptly posted a letter to the Council. He informed that reforming body that he "was waiting for orders." His presumption was that he was still "in the service." The Council answered: "He may come to Paris, or stay at La Rochelle, or go anywhere he wishes."⁷² The Council was decidedly tired of Cadillac and his ilk, but if it thought that he was going to understand this and leave them in peace, it soon learned differently.

Less than a month after landing in France, Cadillac and his eldest son were clapped into the Bastille.⁷³ The reason behind this action was that the monopoly of the trade of Louisiana had been taken away from Crozat and turned over to the "Compagnie d'Occident." In order to entice people to go to Louisiana, the new Company had launched a propaganda campaign describing the colony as another Eldorado.⁷⁴ Memoirs were made public carefully chosen to represent Louisiana as one of the most fertile countries in the world, enjoying several harvests every year, where there were forests of timber and of precious woods, and herds of buffalo whose flesh was more delicate than the flesh of the oxen in France and whose wool was "of a higher quality than that of the sheep in Europe."⁷⁵ Cadillac, who had just returned from Louisiana, was naive enough to protest publicly and loudly against these fanciful descriptions of Louisiana, and the Company of the West had him sent to the Bastille.

The charge preferred against him, as listed in his dossier, were evidently trumped up as an excuse for the Company's action:

Suspected of having made speeches against the government and against the colonies; accused of having written memoirs contrary to the welfare of the state. Father and son were always going out together in a carriage bearing the arms of the Princess de Conti, which had been given to them by M. Lebart, her treasurer. They lodged at the Hôtel Dauphin and came back every evening at seven o'clock and did not go out again.⁷⁶

⁷² Minutes of the Conseil de Marine on Cadillac's letter of August 29, 1717, AC, C 13A, 5: 16.

⁷³ Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, *Bastille*, Registre d'écrou, 12479: 31. The entry is dated September 27, 1717. Cf. also *ibid.*, 12482: 72.—"Aujourd'hui 12^e octobre 1717, jay ouvert le papier cacheté de mon cachet que ie reconnois etre en meme etat que lorsque ie lai cacheté dans lequel etoit trois clefs lune de ma male que iay retenu et les deux autres des armoires qui sont dans la chambre de mon autesse, que je luy ai envoyé pour avoir mon linge et mes hardes. Lamothe." Holograph, *ibid.*, 73.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Le Nouveau Mercure* for September 1717, pp. 130-134. It was shortly after the publication of this description that Cadillac was arrested.

⁷⁵ Cf. AC, C 13A, 5: 13.

⁷⁶ Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, *Bastille*, 10631: 37. The clerk wrote on the preceding page: "Il n'y a point d'Interrogatoires." They left the Bastille on February 8, 1718.

Father and son were kept in the Bastille four months and a half. As soon as they were out, Cadillac again began characteristically to ask for money. Even before his imprisonment, he had drawn up an itemized statement of the salary which was still due to him. Crozat, he said, had paid only sixteenth months' salary (for the whole of 1714 and the first months of 1715); whereas he had been appointed governor on May 5, 1710 and had remained in office until August 31, 1717. He therefore claims a total of 23,956 livres and four deniers.⁷⁷

The above statement was elaborated in a memoir presented to the Council on March 11, 1718, a little more than a month after his release. He begins by saying that he is in extreme need, owing to the long voyage he had been forced to make. His voyage to and from Louisiana, for instance, cost him 60,000 livres. He does not, to this day, know why he was recalled, unless because of the calumnies of his enemies. After enumerating his long and varied services, he says that he now finds himself "without a sol." He is sixty years old and has a numerous family, but is without employment, without any pension, without protection, after having been out of the kingdom for so long. Lastly, he has spent five months in the Bastille with his son, whose lieutenantancy in Louisiana has been taken away.⁷⁸ Neither he nor his son knows what may have been the cause of this disgrace. Hence he is asking for the continuation of his pay as governor, "or at least a yearly gratuity until he can find some employment so that he can make a living in France and not be obliged to beg in the streets."⁷⁹

He clearly had no intention of "begging in the streets" so long as he could get money from the Council. When that body granted his first request, for his pay as governor from the time of his nomination May 5, 1710, until the end of 1712,⁸⁰ he at once petitioned for his salary from May 1, 1715 until September 1, 1717. As soon as Cadillac began to ask for his pay, the Council had written to Cro-

⁷⁷ *Estat des appointmens qui sont dus au Sieur de Lamothe*, AC, C 11E, 15: 85.

⁷⁸ Cadillac's son wrote to the Conseil de la Marine on the same day, saying that while he was in the Bastille, the Company of the West had taken away his lieutenantancy. He asked for a captaincy in Canada or in the Islands. He recalled that he was a cadet from 1701 to 1705, in which year he was made an ensign, and then a lieutenant. In all, he has been seventeen years in the service. Cadillac *fils* to the Conseil de Marine, March 11, 1718, AM, B 1, 29: 249.

⁷⁹ Cadillac to the Conseil de Marine, March 11, 1718, *ibid.*, 272v-273v.

⁸⁰ Conseil de Marine to Cadillac, March, 1718, AC, B1, 29: 397-397v. The order to pay is dated April 9, AC, F 1, 20: 46.

zat for information,⁸¹ and as the financier did not answer, a second letter was sent to him.⁸² The answer to this second letter was commented upon by Cadillac, who made a distinction between Crozat as treasurer in Louisiana and as merchant. The Régent granted Cadillac's petition,⁸³ but still the latter was not satisfied. Less than three weeks later, he again wrote to the Council asking that he be paid his salary for the last four months of 1717 and the first four months of 1718, for he was, he said, without money for his own subsistence and that of his family.⁸⁴ The Régent answered that since Cadillac had been paid up to December 31, 1717, that is, four months after he had ceased to have any right to his salary as governor, "His Highness wishes that you wait for his orders on this matter."⁸⁵

Though Cadillac thus succeeded in wangling from the Régent his salary after he had ceased to earn it, if he had ever earned it, there was another matter which was still pending: the question of his property at Detroit. While still in Louisiana after the death of Laforest (1714), he had taken Tonti to task about the disposition of his property, but the latter was even more determined than Laforest and wanted to go to France to defend himself there. The fight over this property was continued by Cadillac's heirs long after his death,⁸⁶ until 1787 when the Massachusetts Assembly gave Cadillac's granddaughter, Mme Grégoire, that part of Mt. Desert which had not been sold. His heirs finally abandoned the concession in 1811, and thereafter are "lost to sight."⁸⁷

Cadillac's own interest in the Detroit property is manifested in the flood of memoirs and begging letters which he let loose upon

⁸¹ Conseil de Marine to Crozat, March 18, 1718, AC, B 40: 107.

⁸² *Id.* to *Id.*, April 3, 1718, *ibid.*, 116.

⁸³ Minutes of the Conseil de Marine on Cadillac's request for arrears of pay, May 3, 1718, AM, B 1, 29: 434-436. The order to pay is dated May 6, 1718, AC, F 1, 20: 49.

⁸⁴ Cadillac to the Conseil de Marine, May 24, 1718, AM, B 1, 29: 538.

⁸⁵ Conseil de Marine to Le Couturier, September 30, 1718, AC, B 40: 181v.—Cadillac had also asked for the reimbursement of 1,080 livres which he paid for the renting of a house when he arrived in Louisiana (AM, B 1, 29: 248v and 437). The order to pay is dated May 6, 1718, AC, F 1, 20: 50.

⁸⁶ Margry, 5: 346 note 1; MPHS, 34: 106-107, etc. Cf. AN, Côte C, Marine 163, pièce 6. In the abstract printed in MPHS, the widow and sons of Cadillac asked permission on Feb. 10, 1733, to go to Detroit, settle, and have the same rights as Cadillac had had; they added considerable to the claims he had been making, saying that he had built a brewery, a smithy, and gardens, at a cost of 150,000 livres to himself. If His Majesty did not want Detroit resettled the Cadillac's would take, in lieu of Detroit, either the revenues from Castell Sarrazin or a pension for each of themselves!

⁸⁷ G. E. Street, *Mount Desert*, Boston and New York, 1905, 128 ff.

the Council between 1718 and 1722.⁸⁸ A full analysis of this mass of writing would be wearisome, since each succeeding memoir repeats its predecessors with slight variations, and with unsupported accusations against all and sundry. How completely he misrepresented conditions at Detroit can be seen from the marginal notations made by Vaudreuil and Bégon. The latter had succeeded Raudot as intendant, and the Council sent Cadillac's memoirs to them both for comment and clarification. The marginal "answers" of the governor and the intendant are dated from Quebec, November 4, 1721, three years after Cadillac's first memoir to the Council on this subject.⁸⁹

They begin by making it quite clear that Cadillac was not at all instrumental in making the peace with the Iroquois in 1700. Next they remark that when Detroit was founded in 1701, the king, and not Cadillac, had paid for it. The clearing of the land was done partly at the king's expense and partly at the expense of the Company; and later extensions of the clearing did not cost Cadillac a cent, since this work was done by the soldiers whose pay he himself kept. As for the fort of Detroit, it had been greatly reduced at the time of the war with the Foxes, and Cadillac's house is now outside the fort.

In one of his memoirs Cadillac speaks of the "whole of Detroit" having been cleared, that is, from the discharge of Lake Huron to the entrance of Lake Erie; but all the land cultivated, including that of the French and of the Indians, comprises four and three-fourths leagues (about 13 miles), quite a difference from the 125 miles that comprise the "whole of Detroit." As for the concessions granted to his children, to which Cadillac refers, no clearing was made and no house was ever built on this land; yet one of the chief conditions for the validity of concessions was to have had a house built on the land within a year and a day, on penalty of forfeiting the land grant. Instead of the 276 Frenchmen whom Cadillac claimed to be at Detroit, in 1721, the only French inhabitants there at the time were Delorme, Desrochers, Aubin and the widow Beauceron, each of whom had two arpents frontage on twenty arpents deep.

The different tribes which Cadillac named as settled near Detroit were simply clans of one tribe. Cadillac, the administrators of Canada go on to say, cannot claim any reward for having enticed these

⁸⁸ All these memoirs are in AC, C 11E, 15: 91 ff; most of them are translated in MPHS, 33: 598 ff, 602 ff, 614 ff, etc.

⁸⁹ Vaudreuil and Bégon to the Conseil de Marine, November 4, 1721, MPHS, 33: 677 ff.

Indians to come to Detroit, for the presents which he gave them were sent by the king or by the Company. While he had the exclusive privilege of trade at Detroit, only two tribes came near the settlement: the Potawatomi and the Foxes.

Cadillac also said that he had induced tribes to come to Detroit who lived three and four hundred leagues away. Vaudreuil and Bégon explained to the Council that the most remote tribes were those of Michilimackinac, which was one hundred and thirty leagues from Detroit. When he "induced" these Indians to come, and gave notice to the tribes living on the shores of Green Bay and at Chequamegon, all the presents which he sent them were paid for by the king. He did not incur any expense for the forts which the Indians themselves built, for the gates of these forts were made by a carpenter paid by the king, "and no house was built within these forts for the missionaries, as there have not been any missionaries in the village from the first settlement until now."

They then made clear the status of the missionaries at Detroit. From 1701 to 1706, there was one Recollect at the post (Father De l'Halle), who was taking care of the French in the fort itself. In 1706, two Recollects went to Detroit and also lived within the fort; one of these two, Father Dominique De la Marche, learned the Huron language, and three years later returned to Quebec. Since that time there has been only one Recollect at Detroit. The two Recollects were paid by the king from 1706 to 1709, receiving 500 livres each. The surgeon and the armorer at the fort were also paid by the king until 1709, when Pontchartrain wrote that from then on Cadillac would have to defray these expenses. Beginning with 1709, the chaplain at the fort was paid partly by Cadillac and partly by the inhabitants. The chapel furnishings were originally bought by the Company, but since Cadillac later reimbursed the Company for this expense, Vaudreuil and Bégon admit that the furnishings now belong to him.

As for the salary which Cadillac paid to the interpreter, he has been sufficiently repaid by the profits of the trade which he carried on with the Indians, since all trade would have been impossible had there been nobody to serve as intermediary between himself and the Indians. He neither fed nor paid any of the officers who served under him; but merely allowed Laforest to bring to Detroit two canoes laden with merchandise, while the other officers were allowed to bring one canoe each.

Since Acadia is now in the hands of the English, his "fief" at

Port Royal is now lost to him. The island of Mt. Desert, as well as a grant on the mainland of four square leagues, cannot be made the basis of a claim for reimbursement: "He has only been once to Mt. Desert Island, about thirty years ago. MM. de Vaudreuil and de Ramezay saw for themselves, on their way to France [in 1716], that there was no settlement there at the time. Hence the favor which the king did him in granting that seigniori has caused him no expense."

His Majesty, therefore, need not take any notice of the so-called claims of Cadillac, since it is notorious that by trading with the Indians at Detroit, he made large profits which sufficiently indemnify him. He is entitled, however, to what Pierre Roy took into custody when Cadillac left Detroit, and his cattle ought to be returned to him. His "buildings" at Detroit consist of a house of stakes, and of a barn which was destroyed during the war with the Foxes. If Cadillac wishes to sue, he can do so in Canada, where there are judges at Quebec, Montreal and Three Rivers, and he can, if he wishes, appeal to the Sovereign Council.

This answer of Vaudreuil and Bégon must have reached France by the beginning of 1722. Since the claims and counterclaims had by now been dragging on for four years, it was time to put an end to them. So on May 19, 1722, the king issued an edict which settled once for all Cadillac's claims on Detroit.

The edict begins by recalling the origins of the settlement, and then summarizes the contents of Cadillac's letters and memoirs as well as the answers of Vaudreuil and Bégon. It next mentions the various decrees issued by the king, and the letters patent of April, 1716, which revoked all concessions made by Cadillac at Detroit.⁹⁰ Finally, it states very exactly what Cadillac is entitled to at present:

He shall be put in possession of the land cleared by him at Detroit, but no more than forty arpents in depth. In two years' time counting from today, Cadillac must place landmarks on this property and report the said landmarks to Paris. According to the royal letters patent issued on July 23, 1720,⁹¹ on all cleared land His Majesty grants the rights of fishing and hunting, as also the ownership of buildings erected outside the fort. Cadillac has the right to all the lands granted by himself to the inhabitants of Detroit if these grants have not been abandoned, but he has no right to claim the ten livres which he demanded for such concessions. "The said

⁹⁰ *Jugements et délibérations du Conseil Souverain*, 6: 1213.

⁹¹ In *MPHS*, 33: 670 f.

Sieur de Lamothe, his heirs and assigns, may have the possession of all the above as of something belonging to them, without having to pay any moneys or indemnity to His Majesty or to his successors."

The king goes on to declare that Cadillac should be put in possession of all his movables and belongings which are at Detroit, and he may bring suit wherever he wishes against those who have taken the said movables and belongings, but he may not sue for the ammunition and other goods which were taken from Cadillac's warehouse for the defense of Detroit in 1712. The restitution of ammunition and other goods must be made by sieur Dubuisson, who shall be constrained to indemnify sieur de Lamothe. "His Majesty has granted the sum of 2,000 livres, which he wishes the royal treasurer to pay to him in virtue of the ordinance which will be sent to that effect, and he has non-suited the said Sieur de Lamothe of all his other demands and petitions. All the above shall be executed in virtue of the present edict notwithstanding any opposition whatsoever."⁹²

Later in 1722, Vaudreuil and Bégon wrote to the Council that they would "conform to the decree and take in hand its execution."⁹³ In the following year they wrote again saying that Cadillac "has only been allowed two years from the date of the edict" to have the boundaries of his land marked and to forward a report to the king.⁹⁴ By this time, Cadillac was too old to go back to Canada, so he sold his Detroit rights to a man in Quebec, Joseph Baudry dit Lamarche. This man brought suit against Tonti, demanding that the latter pay him for Cadillac's farm and mill, and that he make good the price of the cattle. The lengthy delays and the long correspondence with France on this subject until the death of Tonti (1727) are outside the scope of this book.

On September 19, 1723, Cadillac was inducted as mayor of Castelsarrasin (a small town situated twelve miles from Montauban, Tarn-et-Garonne) with a yearly salary of 120 livres.⁹⁵ Hence he must have applied for this office shortly after the date of the edict of May 1722.

His last years are as little known as the years which precede his coming to America. He died at Castelsarrasin on October 15, 1730. The burial acted reads as follows:

⁹² Arrest en faveur du Sr de la Mothe Cadillac, May 19, 1722, AC, B 45: 869-885.

⁹³ Vaudreuil and Bégon to the Conseil de Marine, October 17, 1722, MPHS, 33: 709 f.

⁹⁴ Vaudreuil and Bégon to Maurepas, October 14, 1723, MPHS, 34: 12.

⁹⁵ Commission as mayor for Cadillac, MPHS, 34: 298 f.

In the year one thousand seven hundred and thirty, on October the sixteenth, was buried in the church of the Reverend Carmelite Fathers, Messire Antoine [de] Lamothe Cadillac, knight of the military order of St. Louis, former governor for the king of the Province of Louisiana, chief of the Superior Council of the said province, and former governor of this town of Castelsarasin. He died around midnight, aged about seventy-three years. MM. François de Lamothe Cadillac, his son, and Jean Pierre Descombels, who have signed with me, attended the funeral.

Albepar, priest, curate; François de Lamothe Cadillac; Descombels.⁹⁶

The only other detail which we know about Cadillac is found in the inventory which his son, Joseph de Lamothe Cadillac, asked to be taken in 1731. From it we learn that Cadillac is probably the only settler in the American wilderness who had his portrait painted. The inventory reads that there were "four paintings, one with a gilded frame, representing the said sieur de Lamothe, and three others, without frame, representing Dame de Guyon, sieur de Lamothe, his son, and his eldest daughter."⁹⁷ What became of this portrait is not known.

* * * *

For a final estimate of Cadillac's character and contribution to the development of the French colonies in our Great Lakes area and in Louisiana, it would be very pleasant to be able to say at least some few words of praise, especially at this time when Detroit is celebrating its foundation by Cadillac two hundred and fifty years ago. However much the writers devoted to the history of Michigan have endeavored to advance the cause of their pioneer they have found themselves singularly lacking in evidence of stability and maturity. Scene by scene, in Acadia, in Quebec, Montreal, Michilimackinac, Detroit, Louisiana, and in France, his character remained undeveloped as years went by.

In Louisiana and Mississippi others have attempted to make something of a hero of their pioneer. Henry P. Dart, for instance, in his general kindness toward the early governors of Louisiana, hoped somehow to make of Cadillac some kind of a respected personage. In his introduction to Saunders' translation of the previously mentioned Crozat documents he calls for a newer evaluation of the Crozat monopoly, one which might change Martin's denuncia-

⁹⁶ J. H. Greusel, *Mystery of Cadillac's Lost Grave*, 23.

⁹⁷ Forestié, *Lamothe Cadillac*, 15.

tion. This was, Dart said, "almost wholly without attention to the tremendous local disturbances created by the Crozat monopoly and by the vigorous efforts of Governor Cadillac to force the scanty population of Louisiana to comply with its provisions." Dart was not prepared to say to what extent the new documents on Cadillac would alter the judgment of history, but, like others in the north before him, he seemed to have hopes that Cadillac's reputation might be polished a little. His mind underwent some misgivings when he was faced with the words of Duclos and Bienville. He was already partial to Bienville and he had to conclude that Duclos "was a vigorous, honest man, wholly devoted to the colony." Although Dart did not get to make the logical conclusion it would seem that between the statements of Duclos and Cadillac he chose those of Duclos as true and those of Cadillac as false, and thus could do no more to bolster the reputation of Louisiana's early governor.

In a review of the opinions of those with whom Cadillac came into contact in North America, we recall that the first official was Governor Meneval. His characterization was: "This Cadillac, the most malicious man in the world, is a rattle-headed fellow, driven out of France for I know not what crimes." Meneval's estimate was accepted at the French court. The official who annotated Meneval's letter noted that Cadillac was an adventurer "quite capable of the practices mentioned by M. de Meneval." What Cadillac had been involved in before his arrival in America is not known, but it is clear that he was very careful to keep his past a secret. Another point on his character is very clear. All through his career he sought out for companions law violators or men willing to turn a dishonest penny, and all through his career he attacked most viciously those who stood especially for truth and law, beginning with the Jesuits.

As Cadillac moved west from Acadia to Michilimackinac his abiding passion to make money in any and every way, except by plodding, honest means, became greater. Champigny found him guilty of violating all edicts and laws in the matter of brandy sales. There is no question of his guilt in this and his maladministration in office. Suits against him resulted in fines and a jail sentence. In these he revealed an outstanding ability to "wriggle off the hook" and remain somehow in "the king's service." In his own way he became widely acquainted with the French colonial laws and the processes of law, so much so that one would think he had training in law from the manner in which he followed legalities. But no

trained lawyer would dare to draft such briefs as Cadillac perpetrated. His training was from his constant alertness to see how the law could be evaded and, in the event of his own law evasion, how the process of law could be obstructed. The manner in which he did drag out his own cases is a sad commentary on the efficiency of the French courts and the administration of justice. Cadillac seemed ever to revel in suits and petty legalities.

The Company of the Colony in whose employ he was at Detroit, the Raudots, Laforest, and Dubuisson were each and all keenly aware that Cadillac could not be trusted. Vaudreuil expressed very openly to the court his distrust of the man. This brings us to the outstanding characteristic of Cadillac—his incurable mendacity. He lied with or without provocation, he lied to gain his own ends, he lied possibly to amuse the courtiers, if fact his mental processes tended toward falsehoods, just as those of a normal being tend toward truth. In detail, we have seen how he forged his own patent of nobility. He falsified his name, his parents name, his age, his lineage. He lied about his knowledge of the coasts of America, the interior, about his knowledge of Indian languages, about the Indians, the officials, the Jesuits. There is no doubt that some of his prevarication was objectively malicious, especially when he brought about quarrels and hard feelings between officials or company agents by his misrepresentation of one to another. He practiced the same deceits on the Indian chiefs. As a disturber of the peace he seems to have no peer in French colonial times.

Why was it that the court of France tolerated such a man in its employ? Did the court not know of his unstable character, when everybody with whom he came into contact knew of it? Perhaps the answer to these questions lies in the actual conditions of the court itself, its tolerance of tale-bearing and scandal-mongering, of cheating and intrigue. Certainly, as we have said before, Cadillac was rated as witty and clever, and his letters are perhaps the wittiest that came from the colonies. Certainly, there were others in the court circles as addle-pated and shallow as Cadillac. Perhaps he was merely aping the powdered wigs headed by such as the younger Pontchartrain. Assuredly, he had one belief in common with the courtiers and that was that the government owed him a living. His cleverness and wit and shrewdness are scarcely to be interpreted as intelligence. Perhaps, such a scatter-brained individual should not have been taken seriously, perhaps many of his letters should be

laughed off, and perhaps Cadillac's own characterization of himself as a quarrelsome fellow is the best.

But historians have taken Cadillac and his prolific writings seriously, as they should have, in view of the fact that he was placed in responsible positions. Because he was so placed, some historians have assumed that he was a solid character, capable of assuming responsibilities. There is no evidence to show that he was in any way concerned about the lives or property of soldiers or settlers officially placed under his care, or in any way concerned about duties. From his deeds and writings one can only estimate him as unsufferably selfish. People were for his use, they were classified by him as those who agreed with him or those who disagreed with him. The latter were his enemies, and the class grew so numerous that he simply could not indicate one friend. Where psychologists or psychoanalysts might place him would be of some interest. Historians will conclude that he had neither vision nor ability, for there is no evidence of either. He had no friends, nor did he establish any loyalties. In the rough frontier he was not accepted by his fellows or by the Indians. All in all, the best character estimate of Cadillac is derived from the opinions of the first and last officials with whom he was associated in Acadia and in Louisiana—Meneval and Duclos.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Bibliography on Cadillac

Editor's Note. A note left by Father Delanglez at the end of his manuscript stated that the bibliography as well as the final title of his work would be given after the galley proofs were ready. Delanglez hesitated about choosing a title. Should it be "Cadillac and the Jesuits," or "Cadillac and the Jesuits in the Old Northwest," or "A Life of Cadillac" as some wished? He did not think that Cadillac's achievement in Michigan and Louisiana was worth a complete biography, which, if written, would only have added a few more chapters to what he had already done, we feel. The question was not fully resolved at the time of his death, but from his notes it would seem that he intended to add more about the Louisiana scene, more than he had already written in previous articles and books.

Be this as it may, we feel somewhat obliged to compile a bibliography such as he might have made for his book. Throughout his series of articles published in these pages since 1944, a critical analysis of each book listed appears where it was first cited. The general works and special studies are not many, since Delanglez based his writing almost entirely on archival materials—manuscripts or published documents or translations of these. For a full description of the archive materials one may turn to Delanglez's *Frontenac and the Jesuits* and his *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*.

* * * *

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Paris.

- Archives des Colonies (AC):
 - Series A—Decrees, ordinances, and edicts.
 - Series B—Dispatches of Ministers and orders of the king to officials of New France.
 - Series C 11A—General correspondence, Canada.
 - Series C 13A—General Correspondence, Louisiana.
- Besides these there are scattered references to Series C 13B, Miscellaneous, to D 2, D 2c, F 5b, Lists of people, passengers, and Series G, Passengers and land grants.
- Archives de la Marine (AM): Series B 1—Minutes of the Conseil de Marine.
- Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal: Bastille, Registre d'écrou.
- Bibliothèque Nationale (BN): Collection Clairambault.
- Ministère des Affaires Etrangères: Memoires et Documents, *Amérique*, especially vols. 7 and 11.
- Archives de la Gironde, Series C 128, 131.

Canada. Chicago. Rome.

- Archives, Province of Quebec.
- Archives du Séminaire de Quebec, Laval University.
- E. E. Ayer Collection, Newberry Library, *Cartes Marines*. Chicago.
- Archives of the Society of Jesus, Rome.

PRINTED SOURCES

- C. Barrière Flavy, *La chronique criminelle d'une grande province sous Louis XIV*, Paris, 1926.
- L. H. De Baugy, *Journal d'une expédition contre les Iroquois*, Paris, 1883.
- Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, XXXIV, XL.
- Collections and Researches of Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society*, Vols. 33, 34, (1904, 1905).
- Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library*, Vol. XXIII, (1934), T. C. Pease and R. C. Werner, eds.

- Documentary History of the State of Maine*, Portland, Vol. VIII, (1902).
Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, X, Albany, 1855, E. B. O'Callaghan, ed.
Edits, ordonnances royaux, . . ., 3 Vols., Quebec, 1854-1856.
Jugements et délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France, 1663-1710, 6 Vols., Quebec, 1885-1891.
 La Potherie, C. C. Le Roy, Sieur de Bacqueville de, *Voyages de l'Amérique . . .*, Amsterdam, 1723, Vol. IV.
 R. La Roque de Roquebrunne, "Particules, surnomes, titres et armoires," in *Nova Francia*, V, 1930.
Louisiana Historical Quarterly, Vols. 15 (1932), 16 (1933), 17 (1934).
 P. Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements . . .*, 6 Vols., Paris, 1876-1888.
Mississippi Provincial Archives, French Dominion, 3 Vols., Jackson, Miss., 1932, D. Rowland and A. G. Sanders, eds.
 W. I. Morse, ed., *Acadiensia Nova (1598-1779)*, 2 Vols., London, 1935.
Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Series 2, V, 1899.
 R. G. Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, 73 Vols., Cleveland, 1896-1901; *New Voyages to North America by the Baron de Labontan*, Chicago, 1905.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL WORKS

- T. P. Bédard, "Le Mariage de Lamothe-Cadillac," *Revue Canadienne*, XIX (1883).
 Belmont, F. Vachon de, *Histoire du Canada*, (Vol. II), Quebec, 1840.
 C. M. Burton, *A Sketch of the Life of Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac, the Founder of Detroit*, Detroit, 1895.
, *Cadillac's Village*, Detroit, 1896.
, *Early Detroit*, Detroit, 1909.
, *The City of Detroit Michigan 1701-1922*, Detroit and Chicago, 1922.
, *History of Wayne County and the City of Detroit, Michigan*, Detroit and Chicago, 1930. (Vol. 1).
 P. F. X. Charlevoix, *History and General Description of New France*, J. G. Shea, ed. and trans., 6 Vols., New York, 1866-1872.
 J. Delanglez, *Frontenac and the Jesuits*, Chicago, 1939.
, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, Washington and New Orleans, 1935.
, articles in *MID-AMERICA*, especially 1944-1951.
Dictionnaire Général . . . du Canada, 2 Vols., Ottawa, 1931.
Dictionary of American Biography, sub Cadillac.
 M. Eastman, *Church and State in Early Canada*, Edinburgh, 1916.
 R. R. Elliott, *The Genesis of the French History of Detroit*, n.p., 1892.
 E. Forestié, *Lamothe-Cadillac, Fondateur de la Ville de Detroit . . .*, Montauban, 1907; also in article form in *Bulletin Archéologique et Histoire*, XXXV, 1907, Tarn-et-Garrone.

- S. Farmer, *The History of Detroit and Michigan*, Detroit, 1884.
- Ae. Fauteux, *Les Chevaliers de Saint Louis en Canada*, Montreal, 1940.
- A. Gosselin, *Vie de Mgr de Laval*, Quebec, 1890.
- A. C. Laut, *Cadillac: Knight Errant of the Wilderness*, . . . Indianapolis, 1931.
- E. Lauvrière, *La tragédie d'un peuple. Histoire du peuple acadien de ses origines à nos jours*, 2 Vols., Paris, 1924.
- C. Le Clercq, *Nouvelle relation de la Gaspésie*, Paris, 1691.
-, *First Establishment of the Faith in New France*, J. G. Shea, tr. and ed., New York, 1881.
- H. Lorin, *Le Comte de Frontenac*, Paris, 1895.
- E. Z. Massicotte and R. Roy, *Armorial du Canada Française*, Series 2, Montreal, 1918.
- R. McCoy, *The Massacre of Old Fort Mackinac*, Bay City, Mich., 1940.
- A. Melançon, *Liste des Missionnaires Jésuites, Nouvelle-France et Louisiane, 1611-1800*, Montreal, 1929.
- P. Orhand, *Un admirable inconnu, Le Révérend, Père Etienne de Carbiel, S.J.*, Paris, n.d.
- F. Parkman, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV*, Boston, 1891.
- E. Rameau de Saint-Père, *Une Colonie féodale en Amérique: L'Acadie (1604-1881)*, Paris, 1889.
-, *Report on the Canadian Archives*, 1888, etc.
- E. Richard, *Supplement to Dr. Brymner's Report on Canadian Archives*, 1889, Ottawa, 1901.
- C. de Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII^e siècle*, 3 Vols., Paris, 1895-1896.
- J. E. Roy, *Rapport sur les Archives de France relatives à l'histoire du Canada*, Ottawa, 1911.
- P.-G. Roy, *La Famille De La Porte de Louvigny*, Levis, 1939.
-, "Qui était M. de Meneval, Gouverneur de l'Acadie?" in *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1920-1921*.
- E. Salone, *La civilisation de la Nouvelle-France*, Paris, n.d.
- E. M. Sheldon, *The Early History of Michigan*, New York and Chicago, 1856.
- B. Sulte, *Histoire des Canadiens Français*, 8 Vols., Montreal, 1882-1884.
- H. Têtu and C. O. Gagnon, eds., *Mandements, Lettres pastorales et circulaires des Evêques de Québec*, I, Quebec, 1887.
- H.-A. V[erreau], *Quelques notes sur Antoine de Lamothe Cadillac*, n.d., n.p., pamphlet.
- J. C. Webster, *Acadia at the End of the Seventeenth Century*, St. Johns, N.B., 1934.
- E. O. Wood, *Historic Mackinac*, 2 Vols., New York, 1918.

Report on Mission Santa Rosalía

Introduction

In an earlier volume of this quarterly an analysis was made of the contents of the record book kept at the old mission of Santa Rosalía Mulegé in Lower California.¹ Records of baptisms, marriages, and burials were signed year after year by the Jesuit, Franciscan, and Dominican missionaries from 1718 to 1845, one hundred and twenty-seven years. Besides the vital statistics, inventories and accounts were kept. It seems well now to publish some pages from another old manuscript record, and none could be more suitable than Father Luyando's report of 1730.

For purposes of establishing connections it may be recalled that Juan María Salvatierra pioneered the Jesuit move to Baja California when he planted his mission at Loreto in 1697. Loreto remains a place name on the Lower California map, about one-third the distance up the eastern side from the peninsula's lower tip. Eight years later, Juan Manuel Basaldúa established Santa Rosalía on Río Mulegé, seventy-five miles to the north of Loreto. The name Santa Rosalía has now been transplanted to a mining town on the Gulf coast about fifty miles north of the old mission, while Santa Rosalía is known simply as Mulegé. Basaldúa went into the country in 1705 and about half a league up the winding river canyon from the coast chose his mission site. There in one of the few oases of the barren Baja California and along one of its very few streams Basaldúa built his thatched house and church, organized the Indian life, began agriculture by irrigation, and imported live stock.

After three years he was succeeded in the mission post by Father Francisco María Pícolo, one of Lower California's sturdiest pioneers, who in 1718 turned over his charge to Father Sebastián Sistiaga. Sistiaga, noted for his thirty years of missionary work in various of the then eleven Jesuit missions of the peninsula, began the record book of Santa Rosalía. After nearly ten years a new hand commenced to sign the records, that of Father Juan Bautista Luyando, missionary from San Ignacio.

The Jesuits had long been in contact with the natives of that

¹ Peter Masten Dunne, "The Record Book of a Lower California Mission", *MID-AMERICA*, XXIX (July, 1947), 185-200.

fertile upland spot, later known as Mission San Ignacio. Pícolo first trudged up there in November, 1716, with a small packtrain and some Christian Indians from Mulegé, where he was then residing. He found the natives friendly and realized that here, near the flowing stream, would be a future mission. He gave the place a name, San Ignacio. He visited the natives from time to time, promising them a permanent padre. When Pícolo was replaced at Mulegé by Father Sebastián Sistiaga, the latter continued the visits to preserve fresh and warm the friendly spirit of the natives. Finally after twelve years of waiting the time arrived when Sistiaga could go up into the country to announce the proximate arrival of a resident Black Robe. He was to be Father Luyando.

This Mexican born Jesuit enjoyed the unique distinction of being financial founder and first missionary of the establishment at San Ignacio. Upon the death of his parents he had willed his patrimony to this mission. He was designated its first missionary and crossed the Gulf to abide there late in 1727. By October he was at Mulegé with Sistiaga, learning the Indian tongue. In January of the following year he and Sistiaga made their way to San Ignacio in the company of nine soldiers.

The natives were delighted at this fulfillment of an olden promise. Work was immediately begun upon a rude chapel and a house for the missionary. Sistiaga returned to his mission at Mulegé, and Luyando soon dismissed seven of the nine soldiers.² But Sistiaga was soon ordered to Loreto and became superior of all the California missions. This left Mulegé without a resident padre. It was then that Luyando, besides attending his own San Ignacio high in the mountains, took charge likewise of Santa Rosalía Mulegé on the Gulf coast fifty rugged miles to the southeast. This explains how we have the present report from him. His name appears in the record book, registering baptisms and marriages, from October 24, 1727, (which was before he went to San Ignacio) to October 29, 1732. Midway between these dates he drew up the illuminating document we are presenting.

The occasion for the report was Father José de Echeverría, an energetic man, who had been sent across the Gulf to Lower California as official visitor, or inspector, of the missions of the rock-ridden peninsula. History is grateful to him for the letters he wrote, the records he compiled, and for the reports on the various missions

² At least one soldier usually resided with the missionary in these California establishments, both to protect the father from possible violence and to watch over things when the padre would be away.

which he ordered to be made. The scope, the qualities, and the minute details of the resulting documents can best be gathered from the translation of Luyando's *Informe*.

Visitor Echeverría in his letters to the Marqués de Villapiente gives details and figures concerning the newly founded missions in the south—La Paz, Santiago de los Coras, San José del Cabo, and Todos Santos. The Marqués was vitally interested, for he had founded these missions by making an endowment of ten thousand for each, just as he was founder of San José Comondú, Purísima Concepción, and Guadalupe. Thus he became the greatest contributor to the Pious Fund, having given almost half a million acres of land and some 200,000 dollars to the missions.³ Among the reports evoked by the Visitor was that of Nicolás Tamaral (later killed in the uprising of the south) from Purísima Concepción. This is the most minute and detailed account we have of any mission in Lower California and even of the mainland.⁴ At the time Father Luyando wrote his report for Visitor Echeverría (1730) eleven missions had been founded in the crooked peninsula, five north of the mother mission of Loreto and five south of it.

Including the title page the piece makes up eight folio pages in manuscript, plus three and a half lines. The title page, done in a different hand, is otherwise blank. This and the longer title which follows within we omit. Many words are found abbreviated as: q for que, pe for padre, genal for general. Missing accents have been supplied when called for. The punctuation, paragraphing, and sentence structure of Luyando follow loose rules or none at all. Sentences run on interminably with the tail of one attached to the next. Dropped words or phrases have been inserted in brackets in order to convey a clear meaning in English.

Besides the intimate picture of a particular Lower California mission which is portrayed, a few points may be indicated as classical not only to the California missions, but to the Jesuit mission system of New Spain in general: the clustering of groups of families in the mission pueblo; the organization of the village life with the appointment of Indian officials; the exact and consistent order of the day

³ Some of the letters of Echeverría to the Marqués may be found in the *Biblioteca Nacional, California*, leg. 53. These have been abridged and edited by Fernando Ocaranza, *Crónicas y relaciones del Occidente de México*, 2 vols., México, 1937 and 1939, I, 77 ff. Echeverría's personal report is given in part by Miguel Venegas, *Impressas Apostólicas*, 604 ff. A copy of this rare manuscript is in the Bolton Collection, University of California.

⁴ Tamaral's report may be found in Constantino Bayle, *Misión de la Baja California*, Madrid, 1946, 212 ff., and in *Doc. Hist. Mez.*, ser. IV, t. 5.

for meals, work, instruction, and prayer; the recurrent plague and the decrease in population; the indication of decreasing birth rate; the slim number of neophytes among whom the missionaries worked in that area; the establishment of roads connecting the Indian clusters to the mother mission; the procuring of food. This last was an exceedingly important factor, more so than elsewhere in New Spain, for the survival of the mission. It was almost a psychological necessity for the Indians' acceptance of Christianity.

Document: Luyando's Report

Report drawn up by me on the nineteenth of January, 1730, by order of Father Visitor General, Joseph de Echeverría, concerning the spiritual and temporal condition, the distribution [of its *rancherías*],⁵ and the government of the mission of Santa Rosalía Mulegé.

The mission was founded near the sea at the mouth of the abundant stream called Mulegé. When in flood it carries a large amount of water, but it has been impossible for the three fathers who successively have cared for and administered the mission to make use of it at such times for the irrigation of their fields, though they have tried repeatedly. The difficulty is that the bed of the stream from its source is very low. Sand banks mark its course so that there appears to be less water than the stream really contains, as experience has shown in the many dams made for the purpose of irrigation.

In this place a house has been built containing three rooms and there is a newly built granary. To the right towards the east is the church which was finished last year. Although it is of adobe it is finished inside and out with mortar and whitewash. At the corner stands the sacristy of sufficient size for the proportions of the church, which is thirty-six by seven *varas*.⁶ The church is appropriately decorated and contains ornaments of every moderate color. On feast days it is especially adorned.

⁵ A *ranchería* is a small cluster or string of huts or the group of families living in the huts near one another. Village or pueblo or settlement hardly gives the exact designation. A *ranchería* sometimes meant merely a half dozen families living along the banks of a stream or on a hillside. The Lower California Indian was extremely attached to the precise spot of earth upon which he had been dropped at birth. It was mostly impossible to get the native to come to live in the mission pueblo. Hence the wide scattering of the *rancherías*. Most natives never lived under a roof.

⁶ A *vara* is 2.78 of a yard.

The people whom the mission cares for are few, even though at the beginning of its establishment it contained within its limits more than three thousand souls. The continual epidemics,⁷ and the fact that other missions were founded which incorporated some groups formerly in charge of the father of this one, [have reduced its numbers.] It had been impossible to look after the whole population satisfactorily.⁸ Today [the mission] comprises thirteen *rancherías*, though formerly there were more. With great difficulty were we able to achieve this reduction [of the natives] into the thirteen groups, which altogether comprise one hundred and thirteen families and three hundred and forty-six persons including the children and the old.⁹

The first is Santa Rosalía Mulegé, the head of the mission as it is called, and counts fourteen families which with the children make up the number of fifty-seven persons. The second is San Luis Kaeolopú with five families, each one of which wanders about on its own in different locations along the coast. They constitute thirteen persons including two children. The area lies seven leagues to the east of Mulegé and it marks the eastern boundary of the mission, being on the coast.¹⁰ The third is La Punta which they

⁷ This is a common story. The gathering together of the neophytes into pueblos, when it could be done, facilitated the spread of diseases deadly to the Indian.

⁸ The neighboring missions were La Purísima, southwest, begun by the Spanish Father Nicolás Tamaral in 1722; Guadalupe, west, established by the German Father Everard María Helen in 1720; and San Ignacio, northwest, founded by Luyando in 1728.

⁹ The paucity of children shown not only for 1730 but throughout this record of Santa Rosalía was quite general in Lower California as well as in the mainland missions across the Gulf. Tribes appeared to be dying out. Take one case: Santiago in the south had 350 people in 1745, but only 198 in 1762. See reports of the Jesuit provincial, Escobar, in Gerardo Decorme, *La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos*, Mexico, 1941, II, 530 ff., and of the visitor, Lizasoain, in W. B. Stevens Collectiton, University of Texas, Austin.

¹⁰ There is no way of knowing precisely how many miles there were to the leagues mentioned here by Luyando. It is safe to assume that he is using "time" leagues, that is for example, an hour's walk being the equivalent of two leagues, although actually the ground distance covered would be no more than two miles. The area of San Luis Kaeolopú is at the most seven miles air-line from Mulegé yet Luyando calls the distance seven leagues, which would be at least fourteen miles. In the next instance, La Punta is between six and seven air-line miles, but Luyando calls it a canoe ride of two leagues. Using this same two league measure as a yardstick for the overland trail mentioned as going around the Bay of Concepción it is impossible to see how the distance could be twenty-eight leagues. One or the other computation of his league is wrong according to actual land measurements, but both may be correct if time of travel is considered as the gauge. Thus leagues over mountains and river barriers would be far shorter than leagues where the travel was fast. So too, the speed of the individual traveler would change the length of Luyando's league, for he mentions the people of Santa Rosa as thirty-seven league away from Mulegé, "more

call Concepcion [Point]. It is on the bay and to visit it one goes in a canoe. By water it is two leagues away, but the overland trail is twenty-eight leagues, for it must go around the bay. Most of those who belong to this *ranchería* live today near the house of the father because this makes it easier to care for them.¹¹ Nevertheless, two families continue to reside there occasionally. The third is San Marcos.¹² It is eight leagues north of Mulegé and comprises five families which hardly make up thirteen people. The fourth is San Lucas Amunaā¹³ six leagues beyond San Marcos and likewise on the coast. It has two families which number eight persons. It has not been easy to incorporate them into [the *ranchería*] of San Marcos, for experience has shown that if for some days they remain united, they soon make off to their own district which abounds in fish and food as does San Marcos.

There follows at ten leagues distance the *ranchería* of Santa Agueda (already in the mountains) because five leagues beyond San Lucas the trail leaves the coast so that the next five leagues is travel over the sierra.¹⁴ The region of this *ranchería* produces an abundance of the mescal and other sustenance for the natives and there is good and sufficient water. For this reason, although the people of the *ranchería* are few, there are always found in the region many others who come from other *rancherías* which are within the boundary of other missions.¹⁵ The families belonging properly to Santa Agueda, which is the fifth *ranchería*, are three and they comprise nine persons. The sixth *ranchería* is Santa Lucía which

or less according to different estimates." Again, he has San Baltasar as "four, or, as others think, five" leagues from Guadalupe.

¹¹ In this account of the location of the *rancherías* Luyando is moving counter-clockwise, although San Luis is really almost directly north of Mulegé and La Punta is east-south-east. Mulegé is now at a central point of the crescent of shoreline enclosing the Bahía de Santa Ines; the horns of this crescent end at San Luis (now Punto Sta. Ines) on the north and at La Punta de Concepción on the south. Between these two points the Bay of St. Ines meets the Gulf of California. The present Bahía de Concepción links up with the Bay of St. Ines south of Mulegé, but in Luyando's time both bays were one, named Concepción. The two points are lands so forbidding that it is small wonder that their inhabitants moved in on Mulegé for sustenance.

¹² Third is here repeated, possibly because the padre nodded but more probably because he wished neither to count nor to neglect La Punta as a permanent *ranchería*.

¹³ Luyando often uses the broad accent (-) over a vowel when it is "a".

¹⁴ The Sierra de la Giganta. The peaks of this chain go to 6,000 feet. Santa Agueda was then in the mountains at about 2,000 feet altitude. There is still a road station of that name in apparently the same place, but there is also a town of Sta. Agueda on the coast directly east.

¹⁵ The missions referred to would be San Ignacio to the northwest and Guadalupe to the west of Mulegé.

lies seven leagues beyond Santa Agueda over a miserable trail.¹⁶ The group is large comprising twenty families with sixty-nine individuals. Part of the year these live with the above-mentioned natives of Santa Agueda, because in their district the water gives out, for there is only one small water hole in which some water is retained for a short while after it rains. The seventh *ranchería* is Santa Rosa Malhaac, leagues from Santa Lucía. Although it is nearer to the mission of San Ignacio, it has been assigned to Mulegé, for it is on the coast and the trail from San Ignacio is very rough.¹⁷ It is the end of the *partido* [of Mulegé] in the mountains of the north.¹⁸ It is made up of seven families comprising eighteen people. It is difficult to care for them because of the great distances, for when the leagues are taken into account, these people are thirty-seven leagues away from the mother mission, [Mulegé], more or less according to different estimates.¹⁹

The eighth *ranchería* towards the west is that of San José Kawilimānc. Although it had been large, last year in my very hands it was destroyed by a rude epidemic which wasted it away. Today it has nine families which comprise twenty individuals. It is nineteen leagues from Mulegé and very close to Guadalupe.²⁰ But as with the last three mentioned it is cared for by the father of Mulegé, because the population is small while that of Guadalupe is quite large. The ninth *ranchería* is San Baltasar and it is fifteen leagues distant from Mulegé and from Guadalupe four, or, as others think, five. It has six families and sixteen persons. The tenth

¹⁶ Santa Lucía is still a place name in the vicinity indicated by Luyando. From the mention of a miserable trail we may presume that it lay beyond the Sierra. The present Santa Lucía is about twelve miles from San Ignacio.

¹⁷ Santa Rosa Malhaac was definitely on or very near the site of the present coastal town of Santa Rosalía.

¹⁸ *Partido* in the Jesuit system was a district comprising several mission pueblos or *rancherías*. The main mission pueblo where the padre resided was called the head or *cabecera*.

¹⁹ The road thus traced by Luyando is part of the present highway which runs up the eastern coast of Lower California from La Paz to Dolores, then west of the mountains and back to the coast at Loreto, then along the coast through Mulegé to San Lucas, beyond which it divides, one road going north to Santa Rosalía and the other branching west over the mountains to San Ignacio, thence continuing west and north to Aguas Calientes and San Diego. Omitting Santa Rosa, San Luis and La Punta, which were off the beaten path, we have thirty leagues added on the road to California, between fifty and sixty miles.

²⁰ San José was about twenty-five miles northwest of Mulegé and San Baltasar, mentioned next, was about twenty miles west. The two formed a triangle with Guadalupe which was west of San Baltasar. The *ranchería* apparently was not on the site of the present village of San José. San Baltasar has disappeared from maps.

which is likewise in the mountains is eight leagues away from Santa Rosalía. It is called Santísima Trinidad or Yahagael.²¹ It is made up of nine families and twenty-six individuals, to which number the nine families are reduced. The eleventh is Zacatecas containing ten families which make up twenty-three persons.²² It is ten leagues distant from the *ranchería* La Trinidad. The twelfth is Ametsil-Kaamānc and Ysiluoin, which today make up one *ranchería*. These two number nine families and comprise thirty-five individuals.²³ It is nine leagues from Zacatecas. The thirteenth, Jesus-María, called La Kueba, stands to one side [sic] of the preceding *ranchería* and is about the same distance of nine leagues beyond Zacatecas and very close to the coast. It maintains nine families which count thirty persons. It is twenty-nine leagues from the *cabecera* and marks the end or limit of the partido of this mission.

In these thirteen, as I say, there are included a few left over from six *rancherías* which formerly existed at the foundation of the mission. Among these there was one, San Patricio, which was a *pueblo de visita*,²⁴ which today contains only two persons of the [former] pueblo. For this reason and because the house is fallen down we have not yet repaired it or returned there to put it back on its feet.

All of these *rancherías* have their cross²⁵ and in some there is an *enramada*²⁶ which is the most that one is able to expect from them. In each *ranchería* there is a *temastían*²⁷ who at dawn and sundown chants in their own language an *alabado*²⁸ and other prayers in

²¹ This *ranchería* was on the site of present Trinidad, up the Río Mulegé, about ten miles south of Mulegé.

²² There is at present a town named Zacatecas in the middle of the Peninsula, but its site does not coincide with the description given by Luyando. His Zacatecas was probably at the headwaters of the Río Mulegé twenty miles south of Mulegé.

²³ This and the following *ranchería* were probably very close to the head of the Bay of Concepción on the road south to Loreto. The twenty-nine leagues distance to the end of the Mulegé *partido* would be just about twenty-nine miles air-line, but probably fifty by road.

²⁴ A *pueblo de visita* was a larger settlement than an ordinary *ranchería* which the missionary visited regularly to say Mass and administer the sacraments. It usually had a chapel and a dwelling for the father. In Alta California the Franciscans called such an *asistencia*.

²⁵ A large wooden cross, usually set up on a platform or eminence, was the mark of every Christian group.

²⁶ A bower made of the branches of trees.

²⁷ This is the usual Jesuit missionary word for catechist.

²⁸ A series of divine praises. The first verse ran thus in Spanish: "Alabado y ensalzado sea el divino Sacramento en quien Dios oculto asiste de las almas en sustento." (Praised and extolled be the divine Sacrament in which God is secretly present for the sustenance of souls.) The second verse sings the praises of the Virgin Mary, and the third those of St. Joseph. The air is simple and may be found in Zephyrin Engelhardt, O.F.M., *Missions and Missionaries of California*, Santa Barbara, California, 1929, I, 169.

which he is followed by all the rest. The chanting has been introduced because the tribe is very much attached to it and because it is easier than reciting prayers. Then too, they thus give over singing their lewd and insolent songs in which they were reared.²⁹ After this they all in unison recite the Christian doctrine in their own language, namely the Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Creed and the [Christian] doctrine according to the method of Father Castaño translated into their own language.³⁰ They wind up with an act of contrition and with acts of faith, hope, and charity respectively. These same exercises they repeat at nightfall when they return from the bush or from their fishing, adding the rosary and the litany which [latter] they chant.³¹ Their attraction towards singing enables them to commit the litany to memory. The catechist of each *ranchería* knows how to baptize in cases of necessity which occur from time to time; but he knows that if he does this on other occasions without necessity he will be severely punished.³² Each *ranchería* has its captain and fiscal under whose obedience it is organized.³³ These give an account to the father of all that happens and when punishment is to be meted out they bring up to him those guilty of misdemeanor.

Each year [the people of the *rancherías*] are called in to the mother mission to make their confession. Here they remain for fifteen days to be instructed in the knowledge and the fruits of this sacrament, and if, as is usually the case, there are some who are old or ignorant and thus have need of more time, their stay is prolonged. When there is serious sickness the father is notified who immediately goes to administer the sacrament of confession and to anoint with the holy oils if there is necessity.

At the mother mission of Mulegé where the padre resides the order of the day is as follows: upon arising all go to the place assigned in order to recite the Ave Marías for which the bell is struck at dawn;³⁴ they sing the divine praises and benedictions and

²⁹ Chanting the *alabado*, the litanies, and other prayers was common to the neophytes of the whole mission system.

³⁰ Father Bartolomé Castaño was missionary during the 1630's in Sonora among the Lower Pimas and Opatas. Like many another of his confrères he composed a compendium of the Christian doctrine.

³¹ This was the litany of the Virgin Mary commonly called the litany of Loretto.

³² A case of necessity would be that of a dying infant or a dying pagan adult.

³³ The fiscal was responsible for attendance at prayer and for the proper ordering of divine service.

³⁴ This refers evidently to the recitation of the Angelus and was a universal mission custom in the pueblo where the missionary resided.

then the bell rings for Mass at which all assist who are at the mission or the [father's] house. During Mass at the elevation of the host they sing two divine praises. The first [is sung] by the men, who are immediately followed by the women, in order that they be taught to praise the Sacrament and form a right judgment of the high mystery which is contained in the consecrated host, for truths enter [these people] better through the eyes, and by these external activities belief in the faith is deposited entering thus through the ears. After these divine praises they all sing the litany together. At communion time they interrupt the litany to sing the divine praises and when these are finished they begin again where they have left off [with the litany] and go on to the end of it. The father now finished Mass intones (although I intone it for them) [sic] the orison and other prayers.³⁵ When these are ended while the father removes the ornaments from the altar they sing three divine praises, the women intoning these from the middle of the church and comprising a chorus apart from the others, for on entering the edifice they have their assigned place. After all this the father explains a portion of the Christian doctrine for their better understanding and calls upon one or another to recite it from memory. This makes them more eager to learn in order that they avoid embarrassment and the correction of the father for not knowing it. During the time that the father makes his thanksgiving [after Mass] the catechist recites with them the whole [of the doctrine], concluding with the act of contrition, etc. Then they chant the *alabado* and go out for breakfast. On Sundays and feast days two sermons are preached, one in the language of the pueblo and the other in Castilian in order that the soldier may understand it and for the greater instruction of the more intelligent who as masters in their own language may afterwards speak of it among the others.

At breakfast those who assist at Mass and the house boys are seated each one according to his importance, as cowboy, muleteer, governor, etc. These get a good amount of tortillas and good *atole*³⁶ as I hope they call it; the others of the pueblo get their *atole* watered down. When this is concluded as described each one goes off to his work. The wives of the houseboys go to their spinning and the older ones to their weaving. These turn out cloth, woolen stuffs, socks, and stockings. More of this kind of work could be done if

³⁵ Does Luyando mean by "la oración" the Lord's Prayer, "la Oración Dominical"?

³⁶ A sort of mush or gruel made out of corn flour.

the padre had sufficient food to dole out to each one who desired to be thus occupied.³⁷ In the middle of the morning the bell is rung to call the children to prayer at the designated place and then until noon each one according to his size carries wood to the kitchen. When the bell sounds the angelus at midday [the neophytes] say it in their own tongue, leave their work, and come in to dinner. This is given out to them at the door of the father's house and in the same measure and quality as at breakfast. While the food is being distributed they sing some divine praises to prevent confusion. After a brief period the bell rings and they recite the creed in their own tongue and they go off to work again until sundown. Then the bell rings and they recite the [Christian] doctrine, the rosary, and chant the litanies. When this is finished supper is doled out after which they go back to their *rancheria*.³⁸ Only three or four remain at the father's house to prepare and serve his supper. Then the *De Profundis*³⁹ is sounded and the *rancheria*, etc. recites the Ave Marias.

While the rest are at their work the padre remains with two interpreters to instruct those who are to go to confession, for as I have said the *rancherias* each in turn come in periodically in order to confess. Otherwise they could not be given the proper attention nor food. [The father] does some writing, he presides at marriages, he gives audience, and he settles their continuous petty disputes. All those who have come in for confession attend with the youngsters the mid-morning instruction and that which is given early in the evening. Feeble old women who are unable to seek their food attend these exercises and are sustained by the padre and so at the sound of the bell they are ready for the distribution of food.

Thus far this crude description of the spiritual and political order. The material possessions of this mission are meager, but thanks be to God Who rules the universe, things necessary have not been wanting during all the years since the beginning of the foundation. To-

³⁷ Here as elsewhere it was in part a "no work, no food" program. All the Indians of the mission pueblo could not be fed three times a day, so many had to spend their hours hunting or gathering berries and roots *al monte*, i.e., in the bush. Rabbits, snakes, insects, and shell fish made a rough diet requiring hours of search. Indians who came from outlying *rancherias* for instruction were always fed.

³⁸ There was near the mission church where the natives slept in their huts or in the open.

³⁹ Psalm 129 of the Douay version, 130 of the King James. An old Spanish custom was to toll the bell before retiring whereupon the faithful would pause to recite this Psalm for the souls in purgatory. At Santa Clara in California the old mission bells still toll each evening at eight-thirty for the *De Profundis*.

day the mission has three hundred head of cattle and nineteen bulls; of sheep and goats two hundred head; there are four groups of mares with foal, one of which is branded, and they make up forty-three head; colts at pasture of three and four years, eighteen; tame horses, twenty-five; riding mules and pack animals, twenty-two; colts of two years, six; colts and fillies of more than a year, twenty-six; burros male and female, forty.⁴⁰—As for the furnishings of the church and house, gear for the herds, and tools, we have what is necessary, as can be seen itemized in the mission inventory.⁴¹ For this reason I have not specified them in this report.

Your Reverence's least subject
and most devoted servant

IHS⁴²

Juan Bautista de Luyando

PETER MASTEN DUNNE

University of San Francisco

⁴⁰ These numbers are placed in the right margin of the folio.

⁴¹ The inventory does not accompany the report.

⁴² IHS is a transliteration of the first three letters of the Greek spelling of Jesus. It is a common Jesuit symbol.

Book Reviews

UNRRA, The History of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Prepared by a Special Staff Under the Direction of George Woodbridge, Chief Historian of UNRRA in Three Volumes. Columbia University Press, New York, 1950. Pp. I, xxxv, 518; II, xii, 601; III, xiii, 520. \$15.

Here is the story of the greatest attempt in the history of international achievement to draw all nations together by the bonds of practical sympathy to aid in assuaging the afflictions of the plain people of the world resulting from the ravages of war. Within these volumes are the records of the vast cooperative effort on the part of forty-four nations to restore the peoples of devastated countries "to a normal, healthy, and self-sustaining existence," and to prepare them for a life of international amity under the four freedoms. How selfishness' personal and national, has interfered with the high purpose on which the UNRRA was embarked is left to the future estimates of historians.

The first two volumes cover the period from the signing of the Agreement of the forty-four nations on November 9, 1943, to October 1, 1948, when Harry E. Howell was appointed Administrator for Liquidation of UNRRA. Volume III brings together all of the documents, hitherto printed or unprinted, relative to the purpose, the organization, the resolutions, the general and particular agreements, all basic statistics on financial and supply operations, orders and directives, and tables of statistics on personnel, repatriation, relief, rehabilitation, and contributions. Maps, graphs, charts, and a chronology are very helpful, and there are indexes at the end of the second and the third volumes.

There is practically nothing for your critical reviewer to pounce upon in this set of books. Certainly, the editorial work of the special staff headed by Dorothy K. Clark requires no criticism and deserves high praise, and the printing and binding are excellent. Dr. Woodbridge gives deserved credit to the painstaking historical staff that aided in the compilation, chiefly to Dr. Grace E. Fox and Dr. Clark (Mrs. William Gibbs), who were the historians of the UNRRA from 1946 until March, 1949. Under the guidance of the history staff some 600 monographs were prepared on each office and mission. These have been used throughout the volumes. The basic sources, however, are the mass of documentary materials "filed" during the five years of existence of the Administration. These in vast quantities had to be organized, calendared and filed before the volume could be written. Thus, when all have been culled, the present work will be backed by more than fifty million sheets of paper deposited with the United Nations. When we witness this vast amount of work on just the history of the UNRRA we can better comprehend the extent of that noble effort to get the stricken areas in some kind of working order so that all nations might work together toward a better world. Even under the distressing circumstances of the present and in the face of ingratitude for the rehabilitation efforts made

at such labor and cost and with a spirit of Christian charity, there will be few to admit that the effort so nobly undertaken was a failure, nor will there be any to refuse a large place on a library shelf to this very History of the UNRRA.

The work is a must for all libraries and it will be used by students for itself and as a guide to the materials for future studies. It may be in use sooner than expected as a plan for the next rehabilitation and relief programs. What, of the eight parts, will undoubtedly interest the people at large, after the first three hundred pages on the organization of the UNRRA and its operating structure, will be such chapters as those on Food, Medical Aid, Industrial Rehabilitation, and the Displaced Persons Program. How the Administration procured and distributed over nine million tons of food, valued at a billion and a quarter dollars, how the problem of relief merged into a problem of rehabilitation, how services were rendered for complete health, and what was done specifically in each of the various countries, are some of the many questions answered in a readable way. Anyone wishing statistics may have a field-day in these volumes.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago.

America's Second Crusade. By William Henry Chamberlain. Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, 1950. Pp. x, 372. \$3.75.

In the past three decades the United States was involved in two great wars with Germany. To the second of these a distinguished author here addresses a serious criticism of the strategy involved in entering that struggle. The work is first rate. It has a double objective: to highlight the naive readiness of ambitious leadership to stalk the dragon of world conquest, and to show how utterly impulsive was the choice of 1939-1941 whose impetuosity beclouded the true enemy, the power in the Kremlin.

A prologue sketches the 1917 decision to engage the forces of the Kaiser. Twenty years pass and once more we enter the lists with the Teutonic warriors. In this pair of "crusades" there is a wide difference between what the leaders sought and what they found. Unlike the historic Crusades, which built far better than they knew for Europe though they failed to hold their immediate goal, the Wilson-Roosevelt campaigns reversed this order. Wilson would make the world safe for democracy by destroying German power and creating a new Europe based on the self-determination of nations. Roosevelt, in the same tradition though in a far more climactic conflict, drove to crush the fierce threat of Nazism. In both cases our military strength, supported by the determined endurance and bitter sufferings of our comrades in arms, gained the immediate objective. Yet in both we lost the ultimate prize for which war is fought, peace. We might well have refused in 1917 to embark upon the drive against the Germans, nor did we have the mental and spiritual equipment to arrange a stable peace after the onslaught. In 1941 we not only brushed aside all chance of

agreement with Japan, but we chose Hitler instead of Stalin as the chief antagonist, and in that we committed the colossal blunder whose result is now with us.

These things have been said before, but never with such fine scholarship nor so convincing a conclusion. There can be little question of the patience and skill of Mr. Chamberlain in facing the immediate fact. Meticulous care in handling details, integrity of speech and thorough search for every pertinent piece of data, show his trustworthiness. His previous career as a chronicler of international relations needs no eulogy. His works on Communist Russia are standard. In the *New Leader*, the vigorous socialist enemy of Stalin, he writes with keen penetration and absolute fairness, above any anti-Catholic bias that sometimes mars that periodical.

The account of our entrance into war with Japan makes full use of the most authoritative documentation on that tragic event. After we broke their code—as we had done before in the first war—we came to know clearly what they were up to in November of 1941. Crusading for a "free China", with little realization of the global hazard in that emotional and cloudy choice of policy, we laid a virtual interdiction of the Empire of Hirohito. Their retaliation could not have been a surprise, nor was their strike at Pearl Harbor on December 7 of that year. Yet the knowledge was suppressed at top level, and this low game of high politics exposed the lives of American servicemen, the grand Pacific Fleet, and the bastion of Hawaii itself.

Similarly highlighted is the choice we made in Europe during 1939–1941. Our leadership knew of the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement of August 23, 1939. They knew of and actually warned Russia of the impending German attack in June of 1941. They should have predicted the lethal stalemate likely to come out of that campaign. Stalin's aims for Europe and the world were no mystery to our experts in foreign affairs. Why did the executive neglect all this and decide to stand with Russia? Surely we could not enter upon and win the war without siding with Russia. Neither could the war be victoriously terminated without destroying every power center except Russia, whom we must then face alone with no compensating or assisting forces in a continuing state of battle such as the Lenin-Stalin strategy indicated.

Chamberlain is devastating as he pulls the curtain aside to describe a fundamental point in the relations between the executive and his Congress and public. He writes:

Like the Roman god Janus, Roosevelt in the prewar period had two faces. For the American people, for the public record, there was the face of bland assurance that his first concern was to keep the country out of war. But in more intimate surroundings the Chief Executive often assumed that America was already in war.

In Professor Bailey he finds an apologist for this strange presidential conscience:

Franklin Roosevelt repeatedly deceived the American people during the period before Pearl Harbor... He was like the physician

who must tell the patient lies for the patient's own good... A president who cannot entrust the people with the truth betrays a certain lack of faith in the basic tenets of democracy. But because the masses are so notoriously shortsighted and generally cannot see danger until it is at their throats our statesmen are forced to deceive them into an awareness of their own long run interests. This is clearly what Roosevelt had to do,

And the professor adds in admiration: "and who shall say that posterity will not thank him for it?" To which a goodly portion of posterity, and Mr. Chamberlain in particular, has already replied: "Macchiavelli!" This sense of being "the Elect", the self-appointed arbiter of thought and life, betrays a tinge of the totalitarian dictator who does not belong in American life. How differently, the author writes, did Lincoln behave as he sat with head bowed at thought of the dying soldiers put in battle by his decision. He had nothing of the jocose, the flamboyant, the jaunty superiority about him. And posterity thanks him.

Chamberlain concludes with ten points for foreign policy that must be studied to be appreciated, and to be followed. In a word, our day is no time for amateur filibusterers on the stage of world events. Emotions other than loyalty to country must be restrained, and serious work done on the problems, as he spells them out. The book is highly rewarding for any American who reads and thinks.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Xavier University, Cincinnati

The Yankee Exodus. An Account of Migration from New England. By Stewart H. Holbrook. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950. Pp. xiv, 400. Illustrated.

Rarely has this reviewer seen a book with such potential for contrary reader reactions. Apparently aimed at the afternoon audience of daughters of New England, it has the capacity of stimulating great gratitude, even inspiration, for its meticulous listing of the deeds of "our forefathers" and the Yankee genius that they carried to the other three corners of our country. But to a historian it comes with something more than boredom. Here is a tome whose jacket calls it (with tongue somewhat in cheek) "awesomely plain." On the fifteenth page there stands a dictum uttered with the finality of a true son of Timothy Dwight: "The Yankee exodus to all parts of the American West, and occasionally into the South, is the most influential movement our country has known."

Turner once set down a quite respectable hypothesis on the West in American history. Of the significance of the frontier, Professor Paxson wrote that "no major historian has called it into question." Our author, however, declines even a courteous nod to the Turner idea, and with one

bold stroke demolishes the careful thinking of a first-class scholar. This is perhaps without intent or forethought, and indeed the work has its merit.

Some two thousand families and their various perigrinations form the basis of the essay. The plan is to carry them, group by group, into the unfolding West. Starting with an all too long and dreamy sketch of Vermont, Mr. Holbrook gathers up his founders of towns, religions, ethical—and non-ethical—movements, his inventors and schoolmasters and logging pioneers, and deposits them in practically every strategic locality in the country. There they build new factories, new colleges, new cults and new fortunes.

What of the New Englanders who stayed at home? The dismal picture omits the magnates of industry, commerce and railroading, and the new blood that went into the nineteenth century growth of venerable institutions or the formation of freshly changing cultures. That is not his concern.

In style the text alternates between the drab and the sprightly, sometimes flippant and flagrantly offensive. One only narrative stands out as truly "built" and that is the picturesque account of the Mormon sons of the northeast. Chapter after chapter drones on in a unity that is hardly more than geographical. A very perceptible lag marks the final fourth of the story, as nostalgia replaces progress in any direction.

The bibliography cites an enormous number of works on the matter of the book, and quite a few that could have made it a better piece of history if they were digested. Turner is there, of course, a final wink of recognition to one who once told this tale at Harvard. Perry Miller gets a similar bow. Diaries, journals, notes on the foundings and trials and treks of these interesting people, will certainly aid those who assay the real importance of the New Englander in the making of America. It still awaits its Homer.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Xavier University, Cincinnati

Notes and Comments

In 1944 historians in the Latin American field received from the American Council on Education a blue-print for the model textbook. This, *Latin America, In School and College Teaching Materials*, was prepared from questionnaires, suggestions, and criticisms of existing texts and was designed to inform future textbook writers on what was wanted of them. For example, a textbook should not telescope 300 colonial years into an account of the Conquest, and then at once take up the movement for independence. It must preserve throughout the respect for others that is expected of every respectable book. It must lay its basis on the best research up to date. It may not speak of twenty-one nations south of us as one only people but place them in their concrete present existence as nationalities. It should speak of our dealings with them in the light both of fact and of proper regard for our government. Most of all it cannot make use of the Black Legend, about Spaniards in America.

Editors of scholarly publications seldom permit their Olympian calm the luxury of poring over textbooks. That genre tends often to wish to be a best seller, what though its impossibly pedantic speech hang pendant like an anchor to material that all in the profession know as quite commonplace. In texts the lifted look is found occasionally hiding an otherwise sharp-edged fact that, if told in its unadorned reality, might turn the callow student from prevailing local custom as to ideology, superstition of prejudice.

A text has just come to hand that seems to belie its brethren and approach the model set in 1944. It is *The Rise of the Latin American Nations: A Concise History*, by Arthur Scott Aiton. Doctor Aiton is just about as honored a teacher and scholar as the American universities can claim. In the classroom, in his own academic senate, on councils of national associations of historians and a valuable member of editorial boards, his name carries weight. And he knows how to use the English language, as an expert.

His book appears just now in lithoprint, and is a matter of about 150,000 words. It is done in the conventional scheme of dividing the subject, with the colonial era given space in the proportion of five to twelve for the national era. Despite its nature the book has that secret formula of authorship, true development. The colonial life develops, to maturity and independence. The various nations

then develop. An enormous weight of concrete illustration carries his various stories. For example, he pictures the type of Spanish colonist by drawing on the catalogue of licenses issued to colonists published by Rubio y Moreno in 1930, which shows them to have been "a truly representative group of the Spanish people." As a historian should do, he lets his facts talk. The Ley Lerdo was unpopular, and he says just that, whereupon he concludes honestly that the reaction to the law was popular. No *Leyenda Negra* is found here to mar the narrative, nor the church-baiting so widely indulged in high towers. False fact cannot "develop" a story.

He closes his treatment by a realistic study of Inter-American affairs. Appended is a bibliography suited to student need, and the short clause that the teacher "ordinarily, in each semester, should require a very thorough reading of at least six books." When this volume is freed of a few typographical blemishes, it should go into the hands of the young men and women who deserve the guidance of so gilt-edge a piece of text composition.

W. E. S.

* * * *

The Institute of Latin-American Studies of the University of Texas has made another worthwhile contribution by publishing an English translation of the *Report that Dr. Miguel Ramos de Arizpe . . . Presents to the August Congress . . .* The introduction, translation, annotations and index, a much needed addition to the previous Spanish printings of this famed *Report*, are the work of Nettie Lee Benson. The introduction is a sketch of Father Ramos Arizpe, the Mexican priest who was chiefly responsible for the Mexican Constitution of 1824, and the history of the printings and editions of his account of the four provinces of northeastern Mexico. The editor sticks very well to the report, not bothering much about the details of the life of the revolutionary priest before or after the account was written, but indicating the nature of his ideas of reform and revolution which got him locked up in Spain for six years.

* * * *

L'Institut d'Histoire de l'Amérique française, Montreal, published *Louis Jolliet, vie et voyages (1645-1700)* by Jean Delanglez, translated from the original publication of the Institute of Jesuit History, Loyola University, Chicago. It was deemed advisable by the translators and editors, particularly Canon Lionel Groulx and Dr. Guy Frégault, to translate the *Life and Voyages of Louis Jolliet* liberally

rather than literally, and they have performed an excellent task without so much as attaching their names to the translation. They preferred to term the translation an adaptation into French. Before his death Father Delanglez added some materials and citations to the English edition which the editors have incorporated in the French.

* * * *

South Carolina Goes to War, 1860-1865, by Charles Edward Cauthen, is Volume 32 of The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, published by The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill. It is a readable and very well documented account of the events in South Carolina from the secession movement in 1860 to the despair and defeat of 1865.

* * * *

Comment has been made in previous years on what we consider the most outstanding undergraduate student historical publication existing. This is the annual brochure produced since 1940 by the students of Marygrove College, Detroit. The 1950 publication is entitled *In the Service of Truth*. The general theme is Peace and the documents are in the main the papal pronouncements on peace since 1939. The articles reveal remarkable maturity and the fine bibliography will prove pleasing and useful to any scholar.

* * * *

Jesuit Beginnings in New Mexico, 1867-1882, by Sister Lillian Owens in Collaboration with Fr. Gregory Goñi, S.J., and Fr. J. M. González, S.J., is the first of a series of projected Jesuit Studies on the Southwest. It is published by the Revista Catolica Press of El Paso, Texas, and is generally illustrated. There is a Foreword by Archbishop Edwin V. Byrne of Santa Fe and an Introduction, "The Irresistible Challenge of the Pueblos," by Professor Carlos E. Castañeda of the University of Texas. Part I is the history of the Jesuit beginnings in New Mexico in sixty pages enriched by many documents. It tells chiefly of the work of Father Donato M. Gasparri, S.J., in the founding of the mission. Part II is the translation from the Spanish of Gasparri's letter giving an account of his appointment and journey to New Mexico from Spain in 1867. The has been translated is an earlier number of MID-AMERICA. Part III is the Diary of the Mission of New Mexico from May 27, 1867

to October 18, 1874. A bibliography and index carry the pages to 176.

* * * *

The South Dakota Historical Society is eligible for a round of applause for the valliant manner in which it is trying to keep alive the historical interests of the people of South Dakota with its monthly bulletin *The Wiyobi*. The pages are typed and planographed or mimeographed and hard to read, but they are always welcome for the historical interest of the articles and comments, and as a reminder of the unwillingness of a great State to budget a small sum for the typesetting and for the encouragement of the members of the Society.

* * * *

"WELL, HERE WE ARE! All decked out in our latest finery, and proud as a peacock." Words taken from *Wisconsin Magazine of History* for Autumn, 1950, heralding its new format. "The printers think they are now producing the most attractive historical magazine in the country . . . It's designed to please you. If it doesn't, we want to hear from you. If it does, let us know." Indeed, the directors of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and the editors are to be congratulated upon this pleasing departure from the standard forms of scholarly quarterlies. The wider two-column pages are fewer in number but longer in word content; the gloss paper allows for fine photographic reproduction and colors; the costs are less and the popular appeal greater by reason of new features without sacrifice of the scholarly articles. In all, the change is bound to make history appear attractive and modern to more people.

* * * *

Mission Studies, a new quarterly, made its bow in September, 1950. It is published by The Mission Secretariat, Washington, D. C., under the joint sponsorship of the National Office of the society for the Propagation of the Faith and the Catholic mission aid and mission sending societies of the United States. The table of contents reveals articles on the conditions and problems of missions around the world; "The Church and Independent India," "The Church and the Earth's Cultures," "The Faith and the Peoples of Russia," "Language and the Peoples of Africa." Notes on current trends and book reviews fill out the 128 pages.